

CONFIDENCE Corrected,  
 ERROR Detected,  
 AND  
 TRUTH Defended ;  
 OR  
 Some farther REFLECTIONS  
 Upon the TWO  
**Athenian Mercuries,**  
 Lately Publish'd about  
**INFANT-BAPTISM.**

By *Philaethes Pasiphilus.* K

Mar. 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.*

Act. 8. 12. *When they believed [Philip] preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both Men and Women.*

Act. 18. 8. — *Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.*

Col. 2. 8. *Beware lest any Man spoil you through vain Deceit, after the Traditions of Men, and not after Christ.*

Mar. 7. 7, 8, *In vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrines, the Commandments of Men. For laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of Men, as the washing of Pots, and Cups : (and as we are now told, Men, Women and Children too) and many such like things ye do.*

London, Printed in the Year, 1692.

CONFIDENTIAL

SECRET





## Confidence Corrected, &c.

**I**T is a sad Thing, and much to be *lamented*, that there should continue to this Day, not only so many Differences in point of *Judgment* amongst Christians, but also so much *Pride*, and *Prejudice* of Spirit one against another, by Reason of the same; insomuch, that there can hardly be the least Difference imaginable amongst Professors of Christianity in Matters of Judgment, but they are too readily turn'd into so many Marks of *Reproach*, and Causes of *Malignity*, one against another. This has been very sadly experimented in this Nation, for many Years past; and, to this Day, finds but too much Entertainment in the Minds of many, who still reckon themselves Men in *Reputation*, for *Wisdom* and *Honour*. But, though it may justly be expected, do what we can, that there will still remain *Differences* in Judgment, and *Controversies* among Christians in some things; yet of all the *Controversies* that ever appear'd upon the Stage of Christianity, I cannot but most of all *admire* at this *Controversy* about *Infant-Baptism*: And that chiefly upon two Accounts.

*First*, That ever it should become such a Controversy as it has done.

*Secondly*, At the strange Effects that it has produced.

*First*, I cannot but admire, how this ever became such a Controversy amongst Christians, as it hath done; especially amongst such Christians, as do daily *profess* and *declare*, that the *Scriptures* are the only Rule of *Faith* and *Worship*, the only Guide to all Duty and Obedience, relating to everlasting Happiness; whenas there is not the least Word, nor shadow of a Word (and that by the Confession of Parties) for *Infant-Baptism*, in all the whole Book of God. I cannot imagine what the *matter* should be, that Men should make a *Trade*, of straining their *Wits*, to find out so many *Tricks* and *Inventions*, to maintain and defend a Practice, and count it part of *God's Service* and *Worship*, that they know, and are convinc'd in their Consciences (as appears by their frequent Acknowledgments) is no where to be found in God's Word. There is scarcely any other Controversy, that ever

happen'd in the World among Christians, but makes a greater pretence to *Scripture* than this doth, or can : It is not so much to be wondred at, that there has happened such a Difference among Christians about the Tenets of *Arminius* and *Calvin*, about *Absolute* and *Respective Election* and *Reprobation*, and all the *Appurtenances* belonging thereunto ; because there pretty plainly seems to be some considerable *Glances* in *Scripture* in favour of both Opinions : yea, the very *Socinians* themselves, (which deny the Deity of Christ) challenge a far fairer Pretence to *Scripture*, than any *Pedo-baptist* can do ; because the Text plainly saith, *My Father is greater than I* : Which as little as it is, if the *Pedo-baptists* could but produce such a Glance as that, in *Scripture*, for *Infant-Baptism*, it would be more than ever yet was done upon that account. Yea, the very *Papists* are less to be wondred at, in their Plea for *Transubstantiation* ; because the Text saith plainly, *This is my Body*, &c. Which is a Plea, beyond what any *Pedo-baptist* can pretend unto, in the behalf of that which they make such a stir about. Yet how is the Weakness and Folly of *Socinians* and *Papists*, and others, condemn'd and censur'd by many *Pedo-baptists*, whilst they magnify and bless themselves in that for which they cannot produce even so much seeming Authority from *Scripture*.

I question not, but I may presume, that if a hundred of the most Learned and Judicious Men in the World, should read the Bible over forty times from one end to the other, they would never so much as think of *Infant-baptism*, by virtue of that Reading, and their best Consideration into the Bargain, if the Voice of *Tradition* and *Custom* had not possess'd them with it beforehand : and if so, how justly may it be wonder'd at, that such a thing should ever become a Controversy amongst Pretenders to *Scripture* ? — The *Baptists* say, *Infant-baptism* is no where to be found in *Scripture* : The *Pedo-baptists* frequently confess the same thing. — The *Baptists* say, that whatsoever is not to be found in *Scripture*, is no Part of Divine Worship : — All *Protestant Pedo-baptists*, do freely acknowledg this also. Now who can tell where the Controversy lies ? Is it not strange that Men should pretend to differ, yea, and to differ greatly too, in that very thing wherein they seem to be so plainly and fully agreed ? Who can give any good Reason now, why this Conclusion should not necessarily be agreed to by mutual Consent, namely, that *Infant-baptism* is no part of *Divine Worship* ! Which if it were, the whole Controversy would be gone at once. — The *Baptists* do from time to time assert,

that



that there is neither *Precept for*, nor *Precedent of*, nor *Promise unto*, Infant-baptism, in all the Word of God : And their most Learned and Judicious Adversaries, do frequently grant and confess the same thing ; and yet strive to maintain and uphold the Controversy in the World. This is one Part of my *Wonder*, with respect to this Matter.

*Secondly*, I cannot but wonder at the strange Effects it has produced, and they are many ; but I shall only touch upon one, namely, That though the Principle and Practice of the *Baptists* (so called) is in the point of *Baptism*, so plainly and plentifully laid down in Scripture, and holds such an undeniable Correspondency and Agreement with Primitive Purity, yet that they should be loaded with so much Contempt and Reproach, as they have been, and yet are, by many in this Nation, for no other thing than this honest and harmless, yea, Honourable and Heaven-born Practice. Who is it that is any whit wise and judicious, that knows not that Christ and the Primitive Christians were baptiz'd, as they now plead and practise ? Yet how have they for many years, in this *Christian* Kingdom, been not only slighted, but rendred odious, and counted as the very Dreggs and Off-scouring of the World, even for this very thing ? Yea, the worst and vilest of Men, have been counted worthy of more Honour and Respect amongst People than they ; insomuch, that *Highway-men* and *Anabaptists*, have been almost Titles of equal Dignity. Is it not strange that any that pretend to be the Disciples of Christ, and the Followers of Jesus, should dare so boldly to throw downright and naked Reproach upon the Practice of their Saviour ; and cast all manner of Dirt and Scorn in the Faces of any, meerly for endeavouring to follow him in that which he has not only commanded, but set them an Example in his own Person ? — Though blessed be God, through the *gracious Influence*, and *benign Aspects* of our *Chief Rulers*, this Spirit at this day is somewhat corrected and abated ; yet to this moment, there are but too many that still strive to foment and cherish it. This is the second Part of my *Wonder*, with respect to this Controversy, above any other, that ever happen'd among sober Christians. — Now how far our *Athenian Gentlemen* have contributed towards the Removal of this *Wonder*, I shall take upon me the Boldness a little to remark : — Wherefore now I shall direct my Discourse to them.

*Gentlemen*, I will not say, that you have so much bespatter'd us with Dirt and Reproach, as some others have done before you ; yet



I cannot but observe that you, at least, seem to have a good mind, (if I may use such a Solæcism) to be nibbling at it; and that appears chiefly, if we consider these three things.

1<sup>st</sup>, How liberally and tartly you bestow that silly and idle *Nickname* of Reproach [*Anabaptist*] upon us, so often repeated in your Papers? Though you know 'tis a Name we disown and deny, especially too to do it at the same time that the Question is *militating* betwixt us: Which indeed, besides the *Malignity* that seems to be in it, is an implicate *begging* of the whole Question. For what do you else, when you aforehand briskly take it for granted, that we are a Parcel of *Anabaptists*, making no Question of that, when you know you are a disputing that very Question, which ought to *determine* whether we are so or no? Pray, Sirs, why may not we as justly make a trade of calling you, and all of your Party or Perswasion, *Anti-baptists* or *Cata-baptists*? for you cannot but know, that according to *our* Principles, you do as much *deny* Baptism, and *abuse* it too, as we can possibly, according to *your* Principles, be *twice* Baptiz'd; but we reckon it below any that pretend to Wisdom and Ingenuity, to make such beggarly things any part of their Refuge: Wherefore, Sirs, I think I may safely conclude, you have not dealt so *candidly* with us in this Particular, as you ought to have done.

2<sup>dly</sup>. In that you very unworthily, if not proudly, *insinuate*, that there are none, nor ever were any among the *Baptists*, that are so knowing in the *Customs of Nations*, *Linguisms*, *Radixes*, or *Original* Significations in *Languages*, as you are; and that may perhaps be the great Cause of Disputes upon this Subject: When, Sirs, it is very well known, that there have been, and are to this Day, many amongst them, of very great *Parts* and *Learning*, and excellently well skill'd in all those Matters you talk of. Wherefore, *Gentlemen*, if you are *Ignorant* herein, you might have done better to have kept your Ignorance to your selves: But if you are not *Ignorant* hereof, there's nothing can excuse you from an *invidious* and *spiteful* Insinuation. And you farther politickly expose them to popular Prejudice, by giving them a *Paraliptical* Bite, and by an *Apophasis* cunningly charge them with a *Spirit of Contention*; which may also be a great cause of Disputes upon this Subject: As if your Opinion and Practice about *Infant-Baptism*, was so manifestly clear and evident, that it's scarce possible for any Body to make the least Doubt or Scruple about it, if they be not afore-hand troubled with a *Spirit of Contention*; or else ignorant of the *Customs of Nations*, &c. But pray, Sirs, Why a

*Spirit*

*Spirit of Contention* in the *Baptists*, any more than in *your selves*? What's the Matter, *Gentlemen*, that *they* must needs presently be supposed to be Criminals in this Case for disputing, any more than their *Antagonists* that dispute against them? Really, *Sirs*, if there must needs be a *Spirit of Contention* on one side, it may with a little Consideration easily be perceived, that it lies rather at *your Door* than at *theirs*; if you do but seriously reflect upon the *Darkness* of your own Practice, and the *Clearness* of theirs with whom you contend, *Adversaries* themselves being Judges.

3<sup>dly</sup>. In that you so impertinently and boldly mention several Persons, whom you call *Ring-leaders* amongst *Anabaptists*, who are supposed to be guilty of several Crimes, and remarkable Enormities; for no other end that can rationally be thought of, but to expose your *Antagonists* to farther Contempt and Prejudice. Here, *Gentlemen*, I cannot but admire at your *Wisdom*, (if I had said *Folly*, I think it had been no great matter) that you should be so *inconsiderately* hardy, to venture upon such an Argument as this.

When, in the First Place, we have just cause to question the Truth of those Things, as to Matter of Fact, being, as may rationally be suppos'd, first promoted by Lying and Malicious *Papists*, who speak as bad things of *Calvin* and *Luther*, and the *Waldenses* before them: And may justly be thought, to be taken from them, by some *inveterate Protestants*, which bore them as little good Will as the *Papists* did, or *Mr. Ross* himself. Alas! What strange Work have we seen, even in our own Nation, upon this account? How many good Men have been miserably misrepresented before our Faces, when there have been Thousands alive, at the same time, that were able to have detected the Scandal, but durst not attempt it? How many Men in *England*, have even been *Diaboliz'd* in the Face of the Sun, that in some time after have been little less than *Canoniz'd* for *Saints*? and had it not been for remarkable *Revolutions*, had never recovered out of the shape of *Devils*. And amongst many other Things, *Mr. Ross's* Brother *Edwards* his *Gangrena*, is too fresh in Memory to be forgotten.

Secondly; If all were unquestionably true, you cannot chuse but know there is no Argument in it, it is not only the *weakest*, but the *worst* of Arguments; it greatly reflects upon the *Wisdom* of any that shall venture to use it. For tho *Hind*, *Hannam*, *Cutting Dick*, and the *Golden Farmer* were all *Villains*; yet who doubts but there are many *Pedo-Baptists* in *England*, and other *Countries* too, that are *honest Men*? and not only so, but their *Principles* too may be good, notwithstanding any thing in this Argument against them.

Third-



Thirdly ; If there were any thing of Argument in it, who need matter it ? Pray, *Gentlemen*, consider, who do you think has most cause to fear it, if there were any thing in it, *they*, or *your selves* ? If they were dispos'd to draw the Saw against you here, you may easily foresee what dreadful and bitter work might be made with you, by virtue of this Argument. Really, *Sirs*, it argues you are heavily put to't, and in a desperate Case, that you dare venture upon such *dangerous* and *self-killing* Methods : But you had better suffer a Famine of Arguments for seven Years together, than to meddle with such *Noli me Tangere's* as these ; for you cannot but know, that we might in this Case, give you *Argumentum ad Hominem*, at least forty for one : And if so, then how wisely you have done in this Matter, you may upon farther Thoughts become your own Judges. But I care not to insist any farther upon this, unless we be farther foolishly provok'd.

I now come to consider how you answer the *Questions* about *Infant-Baptism*, chiefly in your First *Mercury*, and the *Second* occasionally, as there may be any fresh matter worth regarding.

The first Question you undertake to answer, is, Whether (as is commonly taught) *Baptism* is the proper and natural *Antitype* of *Circumcision* ? &c. Your *positive Answer* is, that in many Cases it will bear the *Affirmative* ; which you endeavour to prove, from some following Considerations.

And your first is, from the *Custom* amongst the *Jews*, in proselyting the *Gentiles* into their *Religion* : So far indeed (say you) *Circumcision* was not properly a Type, but rather the *Continuance* of a *Custom*, that by St. *John*, our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, had added unto it, all that was necessary to make it a full, proper, and pertinent Type of *Baptism*. Now, *Sirs*, what a strange, loose, unintelligible and unsatisfactory Answer is this ?

For first ; Your *positive Answer* is not so *positive* as it ought to have been ; for you do not *positively* answer the Question at all, either that *Circumcision* was, or it was not a Type of *Baptism* : Now this I humbly conceive you ought to have done, namely, *positively* to have asserted, that *Circumcision* was a Type of *Baptism*, if you had look'd upon it so to have been, notwithstanding they might have differ'd in some Circumstances, as indeed all Types and *Antitypes* do in something or other, otherwise they could not have been two, but one and the same thing : for things that *differ* not at all, cannot be *different* things. And divers things may agree with other things,



things, under some general Considerations, of which they never were *Types*, as well as those that were : *Isaac* and *Ishmael*, were both Sons of *Abraham* ; therein there was an Agreement. 2<sup>dly</sup>, They were both Subjects of *Circumcision*, there they agreed again, &c. yet *Ishmael* was no Type of *Isaac*. A *Horse* is a Substance, so is a *Man*, there's an Agreement ; a *Horse* is a Living Creature, so is a *Man*, there's an Agreement again ; a *Horse* eats and drinks, so does a *Man*, there's another Agreement ; yet neither of them was ever a Type of the other : So that your *positive* Answer, does as strongly imply that *Circumcision* was not a Type of Baptism, as it does that it was.

But secondly, Is it not strange that such Pretenders to *Ingenuity* as you are, should bring a Consideration to prove *Circumcision* a Type of Baptism, which as soon as ever you have laid down, you plainly confess and acknowledg it proves no such thing, but rather the contrary ? For do not you plainly tell us, that you shall endeavour to prove the *Affirmative*, by these following Considerations ?

And the first is, From the *Custom* amongst the *Jews* ; and yet in the very next Words, you tell us as plainly, it proves no such Matter : for so far it was no Type, but the *Continuance* of a *Custom*. Pray, *Gentlemen*, why then did you urge this Consideration for such a Purpose, when you knew beforehand, it was not capable of performing that Service ? Methinks, you should never be in love with such a Cause, as doth so strangely captivate your Intellects ; as not only appears in this, but in other things that follow : *Circumcision* (say you) was rather the *Continuance* of a *Custom*, &c. Now, Sirs, here I must of necessity be puzzled to find out your Meaning ? Your Words are so unintelligibly laid down, that it will be hard for me to know what you intend by them ; and if I should, without any more ado, take that to be your Meaning, that the Order and Grammar of your Words here do imply, I know not but I might wrong you in your Meaning, which I would not willingly do if I could help it : I must be forc'd therefore, to guess at 2 or 3 things, and hit upon it if I can : Some one or other of which, I think must be your Meaning, or else I am like to continue ignorant of it till further Revelation. Certainly these words *Continuance* of a *Custom* here, must refer either to *Circumcision* it self, or else to that other *Custom* among the *Jews* you speak of ; if to *Circumcision*, as one might justly be under a Temptation to think it may, when you so plainly tell

us both *Negatively* and *Positively*, what it was not, and what it was ; not a *Type*, but a *Continuance* of a *Custom* ; who can think but you must mean *Circumcision* all this while ? For how *Circumcision* could be the *Continuance* of another thing, I do not well understand : if you had said a Cause or Occasion of *Continuance*, there might have been some small matter in it, though not very much ; but to be the *Continuance* it self of another thing, is not easy to be perceiv'd. Now then, if this Passage of yours be referr'd to *Circumcision*, then you only tell us, that *Circumcision* was a *Continuance* of *Circumcision* : Which is such a gross *Identity*, as is not much incident to ingenious Men : But if we refer it to the *Custom* among the *Jews*, then in the first place I ask, how could *Circumcision*, which was a *Precept* of God, be the *Continuance* of another thing, that was only a *Custom* among Men ? Was the *Practice* and *Continuance* of the one, the *Practice* and *Continuance* of the other ? or how would you be understood ?

Secondly ; If your word *Custom* here, relates to the *Custom* of the *Jews* aforesaid, then you seem to say, it was that *Custom* that St. *John*, our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, made a full, proper, and pertinent *Type* of *Baptism* ; and then it's so far from appearing that *Circumcision* was a *Type* of *Baptism*, which was the thing to be proved, that after all, it falls to the lot of this Jewish *Custom*, to be this *Type* : Which our *Saviour* it seems, was so much in love with, that he and his *Apostles*, make it a *Type* of their own *Baptism* : Which is not only a very strange thing, but wonderfully remote from your Purpose.

But because I would do you all the Justice I can, there is another thing which I have thought on, which may be your Meaning, for ought I know, but whether it is or no, that I cannot determine ; but if it be, it is very far fetch'd, and must needs have a very uncouth Reference. However, the Supposition is this, namely, that St. *John*, our *Saviour* and his *Apostles*, added to the old *Custom* of the *Jews*, all that was necessary to make *Circumcision* a *Type* of *Baptism* : And if so, then it's a plain Case, that *Circumcision* was never ordain'd or intended by God, neither in its Original nor Progress, to be a *Type* of *Baptism*, till *Baptism* was made a Gospel-Ordinance by *Christ* and his *Apostles* ; which is a very strange and Self-contradicting Notion. For if *Circumcision* was ever a *Type* of *Baptism*, it must be so before ever *Baptism*, as an *Antitype*, could have a Being ; for upon the Coming of the *Antitype*, the *Type* ceases : As soon as ever the *Antitype* lives and is in force, the *Type* dies.

and



and is out of date : how then could *Circumcision* be made a *Type* of *Baptism*, by *Baptism* it self? when according to this Supposition, it must continue all its Life-long without such a Title, and when it was dead, it could never come at it. If *Circumcision* were not the *Type* of *Baptism* before *Baptism* came, how then could *Baptism* be the *Antitype* thereof? It could not come as an *Antitype*, because it seems there was no *Type* before it came. — If you had told us, that a Man cannot properly be said to be *born*, till he is properly said to be *dead*; or that the Father cannot properly *Be*, till the Son lives and begets him, it had been just such a piece of *Philosophy*, as this is of *Divinity*. — But if it be said, that *Circumcision* did not expire upon the coming in of *Baptism*, for they were both in force for some Years together : I answer, it's very true, but then it's a good Argument to prove, that *Circumcision* and *Baptism* were never *Type* and *Antitype*. And this Supposition our Gentlemen do as good as grant, for they tacitly tell us, it was no *Type* before *Baptism* came, and how it should be a *Type* afterwards, I know not.

You say further, Had *John the Baptist*, *Christ*, &c. undertook any new Way of proselyting the Jews to the Gospel, they had not only struggled with the Oppositions of a new Doctrine, but also of a new Practice, &c. Really, Sirs, your Words here seem to imply, that it was some *old* Trade to proselyte Men to the Gospel long before it *began*; for if it was not some *old* Practice before, then it must be a *new* Practice, when St. *John* and our *Saviour* began it. And if the very proselyting of Men to the Gospel, were a *new* Practice, and the Doctrine leading thereunto, a *new* Doctrine, what force can there be in this *Objection* of yours? However, *Gentlemen*, this Suggestion of yours, seems to be very raw and inconsiderate; for the great and principal Struggle of the *Jews* with our *Saviour*, was about his *Divinity* and *Authority*; his being the *Son of God*, and sent by his *Father*, to teach and instruct the World, by virtue of that *Authority* which none ever before him had : And accordingly, whenever our *Saviour* taught amongst the *Jews*, he very frequently, not only reprov'd their vicious and enormous Lives, but corrected and condemn'd their false and erroneous Doctrines, their idle and vain *Traditions*, and foolish Superstitions, wherein they taught for *Doctrines* the Commandments of *Men*. And herein lay the chief Quarrel of the *Jews* against our *Saviour*, who instead of own-



ing of him in that *Divine Capacity* he justly challeng'd, they counted him a *Samaritan*, a *Devil*, and a *Mad-man*, contradicting, opposing, and charging of him with *Blasphemy*, for making himself *equal* with *God*, and condemning them in their *Ways*, as one that had *Authority* from *Heaven* so to do. — It was no part of our *Saviour's* Business, to countenance or encourage any in their vain *Inventions* and superstitious *Fooleries*, which were never appointed nor approved by *God*; but to enlighten their *Minds*, and take them off from all such *Dotages*, and settle them upon such things as were purely of *God*, and such things as he had in Commission from his *Father* to teach them. — And give me leave to tell you, that if your *Notion* in this case, were suppos'd to be true, it cannot rationally be thought, that our *Saviour* could have made any great *Earnings* upon the stubborn *Jews*, by virtue of that; for if he had only taken their old *Custom*, and alter'd it, or added any thing to it of his own *Pleasure*, and made it what it was not before, (as you say) and given it out in his own *Name*, requiring *Obedience* to it by his own *Authority*, even of the *Jews* themselves, which never submitted to it before, and that too in order to their being profelyted or initiated into a new, or another Religion; he would in so doing, have declar'd and asserted his *Authority* to them and over them, altogether as much as if he had requir'd a down-right new *Practice* of them; and have cross'd their *Humours* and *Inclinations* as much in the one as in the other. And as for those that were inclinable to fall in with his *Authority*, and to own his *Divinity*, as he himself asserted it, it may readily be taken for granted, that they would give him leave to give out what *Precepts* he pleas'd, without struggling with him about it: Those that receiv'd his new *Doctrine*, would never contend with him about new *Practice*; for indeed, all *Practice* is comprehended in *Doctrine*: so that the ground of your *Notion* is altogether groundless.

That Expression of yours also, I must a little remark, as another piece of crabbed *Intricacy*, which I cannot make very pleasant Sense of. When you tell us, that therefore this *Custom* was continued, (namely, to please the *Jews*) and had the Superaddition of the full force of *Baptism*, viz. a *Consignation*, or a *Seal* of the *Covenant*: — Do not these Words now seem strongly to imply, that there was some other *Baptism* in force as a *Seal* of the *Covenant*, which the Jewish *Baptism* had not the force of, till our *Saviour* takes

takes it, and gives it now the full force of *Baptism*, viz. makes that *Custom* a *Seal* of the *Covenant* as well as *Baptism*, *Baptism* being the very *Rule* and *Standard*, unto which that *Jewish Custom* was brought? for how could that *Custom* have the full force of *Baptism* added, or given to it, if there had been no *Baptism* then in force, unto which this *Jewish Custom* is now said to be advanced? — And if so, then People may take their choice, whether they will have this last made *Jewish Baptism*, or the first made *Christian Baptism*; for it seems, though they are two distinct *Baptisms*, yet they are both *Seals* of the *Covenant*. Really, Sirs, it is not usual for Men, in the face of the Sun, to speak Daggers at this rate; No more would you, I conceive, if your undeserving Cause did not force you to it. — I see it is not for nothing that you so freely acknowledge, in your second Mercury upon this Subject, that you deliver'd your Assertions a little *darkly*. Indeed, *Gentlemen*, I think you were greatly in the *dark* when you wrote them, and therefore no wonder you were deliver'd of such a *dark Issue*: Which though you seem to be sensible of, yet you seem to have no Inclination to come into the *Light*, that you may see to make better work. But, Sirs, after all this, I might justly enquire, how you came by all this Confidence? *Gentlemen*, I beseech you, who told you, or where did you read such a piece of *Christian Divinity*, as you so boldly *dictate* to the World; namely, that *John the Baptist*, *Christ* and his *Apostles*, did so highly approve of this old *Jewish Custom* you talk of, as to take it, and put a Divine Sanction upon it, and make that very *Custom* a *Consignation*, or a *Seal* of the *Covenant*, and so it became a proper *Anti-type* of *Circumcision*? Does the Scripture, which we all pretend to be our Rule in Matters of Divine Worship, tell you any such Story, or teach you any such Doctrine? Is there the least Whisper of any such thing in all the New-Testament? if there be, pray be so kind as to tell us where; if not, what signify your Dictates? Nay, Sirs, I am very apt to think, that your great Friend *Maimonides*, nor yet any of the *Jewish Rabbies*, ever told you such a *linsy-woolsey* Story as this; yet here seems to lie the greatest shew of your Proof that *Circumcision* was the *Type* of *Baptism*. Sirs, if you did not seem to be a little proud and obstinate in this Matter, I could heartily pity your Distress: but why should you strive, thus to impose your vain Crochets, and Scriptureless Notions upon us; and seem to be angry with us, that we do not greedily swallow them?



As for the three Texts you bring, further to prove *Circumcision* a Type of *Baptism*, which you call *undeniable* Texts; I confess, it might be worth any ones while, to take these three Texts, and read them well over; for they are, as the *Gentlemen* call them, *undeniable* Texts: But withal, do but remember for what purpose these *Gentlemen* quote them, and then forbear smiling if you can. The *Gentlemen*, I confess, were very much in the right, when they call'd them *undeniable* Texts: But they were extreamly in the wrong, when they thought these Texts would prove *Circumcision* a Type of *Baptism*, or do them any service for *Infant-Sprinkling*. The first Text is, *Col. 2. 11, 12. In whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ; buried with him in Baptism, wherein also you are risen with him, through the Faith of the Operation of God, &c.* Now in the reading of this Text, any one might be ready to think, that certainly, if any thing here spoken of, may be suppos'd to be the *Antitype* of *Circumcision* with Hands, it must be the *Circumcision* here mention'd, made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh; and this is very soberly, not only suggested, but (one would think) also very rationally and fairly proved, by the *Gentleman* in his *Animadversions*, as also in his *Rejoinder*: And also in that other *Gentleman's* Answer to your two *Mercuries*. And indeed it lies so fairly in the Text, so easy to be understood, and so rational in it self, that one may justly admire how any understanding Man could miss it. But, say our *Gentlemen*, in their second *Mercury*, The Scope of the *Apostle* here was to take off the *Colossians* from the Rudiments of the World, (then I hope, by the way, it was not to settle them in any old Custom) especially *Circumcision*, which troubled most of the Churches; so far indeed, I shall not dispute: And therefore, the *Apostle* very wisely and rationally gives them to understand, that they had not the least occasion to dote upon these weak and beggarly Rudiments; for, saith he, ye are compleat in Christ, (without them) in whom also ye are circumcis'd (if that be it you would have) with the *Circumcision made without Hands, in putting off the Body of the Flesh*, which is far better than your old outward *Circumcision*; and this is plainly signify'd and confirm'd to you, in your being buried with Christ in Baptism: So that you have no reason in the World, to hanker after these unprofitable things, but rather much reason to be content in your Gospel-Station, and keep where you are: being not  
only



only in a better Condition, in being deliver'd from that Yoke of Bondage, but also strongly oblig'd to persevere in the Christian Religion, by being listed under the *Captain* of it, by your being buried with him in *Baptism*, wherein also you are risen with him, through Faith, &c.

But say you, they might object, We want the outward *Circumcision* to us and our Children. No Sirs, they might not now object at this rate, for this was the Objection that was supposed to go before, unto which the *Apostle* had given a very fair, full and satisfactory Answer, by telling them that they were *Circumcised* with the *Circumcision made without Hands*, as aforesaid: So no room for that Objection now. But this Interpretation is rejected, and condemned, by our *Athenian Gentlemen*; and *Circumcision* must, even by this Text, be the Type of *Baptism* when all's done: But for what Reason I cannot imagine, unless it be meerly because they find these two Words in the Text, *Circumcision* and *Baptism*; and therefore conclude one must be a Type of the other. But, *Gentlemen*, if you will but let our Interpretation pass for Orthodox till you are able to give us a better, we shall in this Case desire no more. Moreover, Sirs, If we should grant you your own Exposition here, and give it you for Truth, I do not yet understand what great matter you would gain by it; unless we give you also what you please to beg for into the Bargain: What if I should grant you, for Argument-sake, that *Baptism* supplies the place, or came in the room of *Circumcision*, and that Christians are in effect *Circumcised* because *Baptized* (as you say:) All this might be, and yet this Text signify nothing for *Infant-Baptism*, unless it were also plain in the Text that Infants are the Subjects of it; but there is not the least glimmering of such a thing in the Text, but rather plainly the contrary: There's nothing in the Text but what is rationally exclusive of *Infants*. It cannot be supposed that the *Apostle* is to be understood of *Infants*, when he tells the believing *Colossians*, that in Christ they were *Circumcised* with the *Circumcision made without Hands*, in putting off the Sins of the Flesh, and were buried with Christ in *Baptism*, wherein also they were risen with him through Faith, &c. What therefore, if I should now grant you that the *Apostle* in this Text should intimate, that in the place and room of *Infant-Circumcision*, Christ has now appointed *Believers Baptism*; that instead of *Abraham's Fleshly Seed* that were wont to be *Circumcised*, he will now have only *Abraham's Spiritual Seed* baptized? As in the case of the *Passover* and the *Lord's Supper*, most judicious Christians do suppose and believe that the *Lord's Supper* came in the room of the *Passover*, and that tho *Infants* did partake of the one, yet

yet they are excluded from the other. Where then would your Advantage be, if we should grant you that *Baptism* might come in the room and stead of *Circumcision*? you would still be as far to seek for *Infant-Baptism* as ever you were. For you know, it is not *Circumcision* and *Baptism*, running parallel in some things, that will make them parallel in every thing; and by the same Rule you grant them to differ in the case of *Women*, why may they not also differ in the case of *Infants*?

Your other two Texts, is 1 Cor. 10. 2. and 1 Pet. 3. 21. the one speaks of the *Israelites* being baptized unto *Moses*, in the Cloud, and in the Sea; and the other of *Noah* and his Family being saved in the *Ark*, &c. Now let all the World judge how these Texts prove *Circumcision* to be a Type of *Baptism*. What course shall we take to frame an Argument from these Texts for such a purpose? *Gentlemen*, because I perceive you are such Friends to a Syllogistical way of arguing, I'll try how well I can do your work for you, which you seem to have no Stomach to do for your selves.

First, thus, *If the Cloud and Sea were a Type of Baptism, then Circumcision was a Type of Baptism*: But this Text implies, *That the Cloud and Sea were a Type of Baptism*: Ergo, *Circumcision was*.

Again, *If Noah's Ark were a Type of Baptism, then Circumcision was so*: But *Noah's Ark was a Type of Baptism*: Ergo.

But if you think this *Hypothetical* way of Syllogizing is not so good as the *Catagorical* way; I'll try how they will look when they are laid down *Catagorically*.

Then thus it must be; *The Cloud and the Sea were a Type of Baptism*: But *Circumcision was the Cloud and the Sea*: Ergo, *Circumcision was a Type of Baptism*.

Again, *Noah's Ark was a Type of Baptism*: But *Circumcision was Noah's Ark*: Ergo, *Circumcision was a Type of Baptism*.

If our *Gentlemen* should not like these Arguments, I would advise them to study a better Cause, that they may know how to mend them: In the mean time, whoever is in love with such Logick, let them go to these *Gentlemen* to learn it.

But *Gentlemen*, I have not yet done with your *Jewish Custom*, I am willing to paraphrase a little farther upon it before I pass it: Wherefore, in the first place, I must needs tell you, that I see no reason but why we may yet question the very Truth of it, even with respect to matter of Fact; for although 'tis true I lay no great stress upon the Business, for I do not much care whether it be true or false; yet I cannot

not



not but reckon it is at least lawful to question whether your Story be true or no, especially a Truth of such an ancient standing as you talk of, and not only so, but a Truth sufficient to make the *Bottom* and *Foundation* of a *Gospel-Ordinance*. You had need of good Evidence, Sirs, to palliate your Boldness; but if you had far better Evidence than you have, as to Matter of Fact, it will not excuse you in imposing it upon us as a *Gospel-Duty*: How great is your Folly then if it should happen to be but a *Fiction*, which seems at least to be likely, if we seriously consider these two or three Things?

*First*; Because there is not the least mention of such a Thing in all the Old and New Testament; the Scripture knows nothing of such a Story, which is a very probable Argument to prove it false: For if there had been such a remarkable *Custom* amongst the *Jews* so long ago as you intimate, Is it not strange, that neither *Moses*, nor any of the *Old Testament* Writers, nor our *Saviour*, nor any in the *New Testament*, should ever give us the least hint of such a Thing? And yet you confidently dictate, that our *Saviour* took that *Custom*, and turn'd it into a *Gospel-Sacrament*, and yet never gave us the least Signification that ever there was such a *Custom* in the World: Which does, at least, very strongly imply one of these two Things. First, That either there never was such a *Custom* in the World in those Days; or if there was, our *Saviour* had nothing to do with it, at least in your Sense; your choice of either (*Gentlemen*) wholly destroys your Cause.

But *Secondly*; Matter of Fact may yet be doubted, because, as far as I can yet perceive, this Story is originally taken out of the *Jews* Fictitious and Lying *Talmud*; in which is contain'd such a Bundle of fabulous and ridiculous Stories, which almost every Man in his Wits is so far from believing, that they must rather conclude them to be abominable Falshoods.

*Thirdly*; Because, as Sir *Norton Knatchbull* observes, (as I find him quoted by Mr. *Danvers*) there is a difference in this Matter even between the Jewish *Rabbies* themselves: two eminent *Rabbies* that were Contemporaries, plainly contradicting each other in this Point, even as to matter of Fact; *Eliezer* affirm'd that the Profelytes were *Circumcised* and not *Baptized*, and *Rabbi Joshua* attested the quite contrary, that they were *Baptized* and not *Circumcised*. Whereupon Sir *Norton* demands to which of them must we adhere, to *Eliezer* that affirms what the Scriptures teach, or to *Joshua* that asserts what the Scriptures nowhere teach? All these things well consider'd, it seems to be more than probable to be but a lying Invention.

I confess, had you not brought this Story as a *Basis* of that which all Christians count part of *Divine Worship*, I should not so much have concern'd my self in questioning the Truth of it, neither had your Weakness been so apparent, whether the Story had been true or false; we might have believ'd just what we had list'd in it without being one jot better or worse. But now, Sirs, with respect to what you bring it for, nothing less than Scripture-Testimony ought to serve the turn; therefore your Disingenuity (to say no worse) appears to be exceeding great in going about to put us off with the Story of *Alexander the Great, Cato and Hannibal*. Alas! Sirs, we may make a pretty good Thift to believe such things as these, if Human Testimony do but hang well together about them, because they are of the same Nature and Concernment with the Testimony that gives them; and if they should happen to be false, yet our Souls have no Dependency upon them. But if any Body shall tell me that *Alexander*, or any Body else, consulted the *Apostle Paul* about Baptizing *Bells and Pots*, and the *Apostle's* Answer was that it is a *Christian Duty* so to do, 'tis part of *God's Divine Worship*, and it ought to be done in the Name of the *Sacred Trinity*; and should refer me to some *old Human History* to prove it by as a Divine Truth; I shall only say, that he that takes this for good pay, deserves to be cheated.

But Secondly; If your Story, as to matter of Fact, were unquestionably true; and that it's so certain that the *Jews* had such a *Custom*, that none needs doubt it, this would be far from being satisfactory to the matter in hand: For first, Who bad them do it? Did they come honestly by this Custom? Was it appointed and approved of by God, or was it not? If you say it was, you cannot but reckon your selves oblig'd to prove it: And if it was not of God, but their own Superstitious Invention, what does it signify to us Christians, any otherwise than to admonish us to take heed that we do not provoke God by our foolish Inventions as they did? And can it be imagin'd that God should abolish his own *Appointments*, and ratify and consecrate one of their *God-provoking Customs*, as a Divine Sacrament in the room and place thereof, to be a binding Duty upon all Christians? Sirs, if you dare assert such a thing, you had need to have special Evidence to bear you out in it; and yet behold you have none at all, notwithstanding you can venture very boldly to tell us that there was no need to have this expressly set down, in what Method and what Persons, whether *Infants* or not, the *Custom* being so well known before-hand; when it may not only be question'd, whether *Christ* and his *Apostles* knew any



any thing of it, or whether you know any thing of it your selves from good Authority? But it's evident there are many thousand in the Christian World that know nothing at all of this *Custom*; What must all these poor Creatures do that have nothing to inform them into their Duty in this matter, but the *Scriptures*? Do not you a little too plainly give us to understand, that the *Scripture* signifies nothing to our Instruction or Direction herein? And if it be our Duty to baptize our *Infants*, we are like to know nothing of it from thence? But those that are ignorant of the *Customs* of *Nations*, (as you intimate many are) must of necessity remain ignorant how to serve and please God in this particular, unless by consulting the *Jewish Talmud* they can arrive at that Happiness; for it seems by this Passage of yours it is in vain to consult the *Scriptures* about it, *Res stupenda & horrenda!* &c.

The Second Question you undertake to answer is this, *What certain indubitable Grounds can we have for the practice of Infant-Baptism?*

Your Answer is now direct and positive, *from the Scripture*. Gentlemen, I do assure you, I am very glad of this Answer; for then, I hope, we shall hear no more of that old *Jewish Custom*, which has lain so long in our way: If you had thought of this sooner, you might have sav'd your selves and me too, a great deal of Labour: for hitherto, the *Jewish Custom* has been the only Oracle that one would have thought, might have been sufficient fully to have decided the Controversy: for it does not only prove *Circumcision* a *Type* of *Baptism*, but it goes further, and answers the main *Objection* in that case; for though *Women* were not *circumcis'd*, and so one would think should have been excluded from *Baptism*: No, not so; this *old Custom* takes that quite off: for, inasmuch as *Men, Women* and *Children*, among the *Heathen*, were baptiz'd by the *Jews*, it wholly answers that *Objection*; and one would think, should fully prove the whole Controversy, that *Men, Women* and *Children*, are all the Subjects of *Baptism*. Who could imagine, that after all this, we should need to be beholden to the *Scripture* for *Infant-baptism*? But however, the case it seems is alter'd, the *Scripture* must now do the business: And I freely confess, that if it do but appear from *Scripture*, that either *Infants* were baptiz'd by God's Appointment, or ought to be Baptiz'd, we ought to be silent in the Case. But what *Scriptures* are these, that thus certainly and indubitably prove *Infant-baptism*? Why the first is, *Matth. 28. 19, 20*. Good Reader, do so much as read the Text, and see else if it do not: Thus it reads, *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Fa-*

I confess, had you not brought this Story as a *Basis* of that which all Christians count part of *Divine Worship*, I should not so much have concern'd my self in questioning the Truth of it, neither had your Weakness been so apparent, whether the Story had been true or false; we might have believ'd just what we had list'd in it without being one jot better or worse. But now, Sirs, with respect to what you bring it for, nothing less than Scripture-Testimony ought to serve the turn; therefore your Disingenuity (to say no worse) appears to be exceeding great in going about to put us off with the Story of *Alexander the Great, Cato and Hannibal*. Alas! Sirs, we may make a pretty good Thift to believe such things as these, if Human Testimony do but hang well together about them, because they are of the same Nature and Concernment with the Testimony that gives them; and if they should happen to be false, yet our Souls have no Dependency upon them. But if any Body shall tell me that *Alexander*, or any Body else, consulted the *Apostle Paul* about Baptizing *Bells and Pots*, and the *Apostle's* Answer was that it is a *Christian Duty* so to do, 'tis part of *God's Divine Worship*, and it ought to be done in the Name of the *Sacred Trinity*; and should refer me to some *old Human History* to prove it by as a Divine Truth; I shall only say, that he that takes this for good pay, deserves to be cheated.

But Secondly; If your Story, as to matter of Fact, were unquestionably true; and that it's so certain that the *Jews* had such a *Custom*, that none needs doubt it, this would be far from being satisfactory to the matter in hand: For first, Who bad them do it? Did they come honestly by this Custom? Was it appointed and approved of by God, or was it not? If you say it was, you cannot but reckon your selves oblig'd to prove it: And if it was not of God, but their own Superstitious Invention, what does it signify to us Christians, any otherwise than to admonish us to take heed that we do not provoke God by our foolish Inventions as they did? And can it be imagin'd that God should abolish his *own Appointments*, and ratify and consecrate one of their *God-provoking Customs*, as a Divine Sacrament in the room and place thereof, to be a binding Duty upon all Christians? Sirs, if you dare assert such a thing, you had need to have special Evidence to bear you out in it; and yet behold you have none at all, notwithstanding you can venture very boldly to tell us that there was no need to have this expressly set down, in what Method and what Persons, whether *Infants* or not, the *Custom* being so well known before-hand; when it may not only be question'd, whether *Christ* and his *Apostles* knew any



any thing of it, or whether you know any thing of it your selves from good Authority? But it's evident there are many thousand in the Christian World that know nothing at all of this *Custom*; What must all these poor Creatures do that have nothing to inform them into their Duty in this matter, but the *Scriptures*? Do not you a little too plainly give us to understand, that the *Scripture* signifies nothing to our Instruction or Direction herein? And if it be our Duty to baptize our *Infants*, we are like to know nothing of it from thence? But those that are ignorant of the *Customs* of *Nations*, (as you intimate many are) must of necessity remain ignorant how to serve and please God in this particular, unless by consulting the *Jewish Talmud* they can arrive at that Happiness; for it seems by this Passage of yours it is in vain to consult the *Scriptures* about it, *Res stupenda & horrenda!* &c.

The Second Question you undertake to answer is this, *What certain indubitable Grounds can we have for the practice of Infant-Baptism?*

Your Answer is now direct and positive, *from the Scripture*. Gentlemen, I do assure you, I am very glad of this Answer; for then, I hope, we shall hear no more of that old *Jewish Custom*, which has lain so long in our way: If you had thought of this sooner, you might have sav'd your selves and me too, a great deal of Labour: for hitherto, the *Jewish Custom* has been the only Oracle that one would have thought, might have been sufficient fully to have decided the Controversy: for it does not only prove *Circumcision* a *Type* of *Baptism*, but it goes further, and answers the main *Objection* in that case; for though *Women* were not *circumcis'd*, and so one would think should have been excluded from *Baptism*: No, not so; this *old Custom* takes that quite off: for, inasmuch as Men, *Women* and Children, among the *Heathen*, were *baptiz'd* by the *Jews*, it wholly answers that *Objection*; and one would think, should fully prove the whole Controversy, that Men, *Women* and Children, are all the Subjects of *Baptism*. Who could imagine, that after all this, we should need to be beholden to the *Scripture* for *Infant-baptism*? But however, the case it seems is alter'd, the *Scripture* must now do the business: And I freely confess, that if it do but appear from *Scripture*, that either *Infants* were baptiz'd by God's Appointment, or ought to be Baptiz'd, we ought to be silent in the Case. But what *Scriptures* are these, that thus certainly and indubitably prove *Infant-baptism*? Why the first is, *Matth. 28. 19, 20.* Good Reader, do so much as read the Text, and see else if it do not: Thus it reads, *Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Fa-*

*ther, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.* Certainly, Sirs, you must be *Gentlemen* by your Boldness, else you durst not have ventur'd upon such a Text as this, to have prov'd *Infant-baptism* : Sure you cannot but think, that any Text in the *Bible* will prove it as much as this ; and there are abundance of Texts that have less in them *against* it. I wonder why you did not urge them by Dozens ! But, Sirs, what reason had you to bring this Text for *Infant-baptism* ? Does not the Text rather plainly exclude them, when it saith, *Go, teach all Nations, and then baptize them* ? Pray, Sirs, consider, and answer plainly, if you dare venture to be ingenuous ; Is any *more*, or any *other*, here commanded to be *baptiz'd*, than what are first commanded to be *taught*, and that too, by the Apostles preaching of the Gospel to them, as it is express'd in *Mark* 16. 15, 16. a parallel Place, where this same Commission is repeated ? If this be not exclusive of *Infants*, I wish you would let us know what is. But, say you, the Order of Words in the Commission, does your business : Well, Sirs, if it do, we are well contented ; for we are very well pleas'd, with that Order that our *Saviour* has here laid down : And I plainly perceive, that with all your Art and Learning, (though you seem to have a great mind to it) you are not able to *disorder* them, to serve your purpose. The words in the Commission, you say, is, *Mathetúsate pánta ta ethne*, disciple all Nations ; and then follows, *Baptizontes kai didáscotes*, and this you say, in your second Paper, you shall ever stand by, ( as the Sense and Scope of this Commission ) to wit, *disciple all Nations, Baptizing and Teaching* them. Good now, Sirs, stand your ground ; mean but honestly, and there's no danger of Discord from any that I know of. What do we say, or plead for, more or less, than you have thus far plainly given us ? We freely grant, that the Word *Mathetúsate* signifies to *disciplinize*, *disciple*, or make *Disciples* : and this must be done, by this Commission, before Persons are to be *baptiz'd* : and when that's done, they are to be *baptiz'd*, and after that, *still* to be taught, to *grow in Grace and Knowledge*, that they may *go on to Perfection*. Now, Sirs, if this be the thing you resolve to stand by, we bid you *God speed* ; you will hardly meet with any *Dissenters* among the *Baptists*. Yet though you not only grant, but plead to this purpose, in your *first* Paper, and tell us you are resolv'd to stand by it, in your *second* : You have no mind we should take this Sense into *our hands*, though you know not well how to keep it in *your own* ; neither have you any mind to keep to it *your selves*, when



all's done ; for you strangely strive to shrink away from it, as soon as ever you have laid it down ; and very oddly make these two incongruous Observations from the Text so read :

First, *Infants are not excluded from Baptism, as is generally believ'd by Anabaptists.*

Secondly, *A Person may be baptiz'd before he be taught.*

Certainly, Sirs, you can never think, that these two Propositions receive Countenance and Confirmation from this Text : For first, If *Infants* are not excluded from *Baptism* by this Text, good now do so much as tell us who are. Secondly, If Persons may be *baptized*, by this Text, without being first taught, pray be so kind as to tell us, who by this Text, are *not* to be *baptiz'd*. If you think none are excluded, or if there can be none in the World, that are *not* to be *baptiz'd*, I wish you would tell us so in words at length, that we might readily give you the Reputation of *extraordinary* Doctors of Divinity. Pray, *Gentlemen*, tell us also plainly, how you think the *Apostles*, by virtue of this Commission, were to make *Disciples* of *Christ*, in order to their being *baptiz'd* : Were they to make People Disciples of Christ, merely by *looking* upon them, without *speaking* a word to them ? This indeed seems to be the Design of your struggle in your two Papers ; namely, that the *Apostles* were to *disciple* People to Christ, where-ever they came, without teaching them any thing in order thereunto. Which he that can believe, certainly need stick at nothing : for if People may be *Disciples* of Christ, without being *taught*, then they may be Disciples of Christ without *learning* any thing at all ; and if so, then sure one would think, that *all the World* should in every, or any *Capacity*, *ipso facto*, be Disciples of Christ. And yet again, they were to be *made* Disciples before they could be so ; and the *Apostles* were to *do* something in order to the *making* them so : but what that was, who can imagine, for they were not to *speak* a word to them, to *teach* them any thing about it. Sirs, why do you strive thus, by your confused Confidence, to deceive People, and bring them into a miserable Maze ? Besides, if this were the Design of the Commission, that the *Apostles* were to make Disciples without Teaching, then these two things will follow : First, That our *Translators* of the Text, were either very *Ignorant*, and knew not how to translate the Words as they should have done ; or else very *unfaithful*, that they did not : For they have, by their Translation of the Text, given us occasion to believe, almost whether we will or no, that *Teaching* must precede Baptism : and really, it seems to agree so mightily, not only

ly with Reason it self, but also with other Scriptures, that we can do no less than think it true. 2dly, If this were the Sense and Design of the Place, then if the Apostles had ever presum'd to preach the Gospel to any Body, *before* they had baptiz'd them, they had gone quite besides their Commission, and broke the Command of their Master : for either they were to teach People by this Commission, *before* they baptiz'd them, or they were not : if they were, then all your strange Prattle to the contrary is gone ; if they were not, then that which I have said must follow : Or else there must be two Commissions in this one, contra-distinct to each other, given out in the self-same Words, which can be but of one Signification, and yet must be understood in two, quite contrary to each other ; that is, you shall, and you shall not, teach People *before* you baptize them : And how consonant these things are to Scripture and Reason, let all the World judg. But, alas ! were it not for the sake of the poor Ignorant World, that are apt to be taken with any thing you say, we need not take any pains to confute you ; for after you had been *peddling* a while, to make Folks believe, that the Apostles were to make Disciples *without* Teaching, you presently, even in the Prosecution of your Proof, contradict and confute your selves : for you say, *Μαθητεύσατε*, which signifies, to *disciple all Nations*, is a general Word, and contains in it the other two that follow : viz. *Βαπτίζοντες και διδάσκοντες*, Baptizing and Teaching ; *the Commission is to disciple, and the Manner how, is Baptizing and Teaching* ; both it seems, as well as one ; without which a Disciple cannot be made. Is not this a clear Confession, that *Teaching* is as necessary and essential to the making of Disciples, as *Baptizing* ? And if so, what will you do for *Infant-Disciples* ? Are you not as far to seek now, as ever you were ? What are you the nearer, if this be true, to baptize your *Infants*, unless you *teach* them too ? you even leave them as you found them, no more Disciples of Christ, than they were before : and if so, had not you better still let the *Needle* go before the *Thrid*, (or *Teaching* before *Baptizing*) than thus to strive to teach the World a ridiculous Trade, and take a deal of Pains to no purpose ? Though when all's done, it's very plain from Scripture, that Persons may be made Disciples of Christ before Baptism, as indeed they ought, even by this Commission of our Saviour ; and that by *Teaching* too, and then to be baptiz'd : and this is not only agreeable to the Current of Scripture in many other places, but particularly most exactly to *Joh. 4. 1. Jesus made, and baptiz'd more Disciples than John* : first *made* them Disciples, then they were baptiz'd.

Secondly ;



Secondly ; You say, *Children are capable of Profelytism, as may be observ'd from our Saviour's Words, Suffer little Children to come unto me ; which your great Skill in the Greek, tells us is the same with, to profelyte.* Now how you would be understood here I know not, whether you reckon that their bare coming to Christ were their *Profelytism* ; or, whether they come to Christ with a design and purpose to be profelyted to him some *other way* ? If the former, then all that came to Christ (when he was upon Earth) upon any account whatsoever, (tho it was to betray him) were immediately by that very Act profelyted to him, the Act it self was their *Profelytism* ; but if they came with a design and purpose to be profelyted to Christ by any other way, as he pleased to direct and instruct them, then certainly they could not be such *eight-days-old Profelytes* as you frequently baptize. Now, Sirs, we deny not, but when Christ was personally upon Earth, little Children might either come to him, or be brought to him, upon divers occasions, as well as others ; and so far as that very thing made *Profelytes* of them, such *Profelytes* let them be, who shall hinder it ? But then that Act must be perform'd, or else that *Profelytism* has no being. But now Christ is not upon Earth ; *Ergo*, there's no insisting upon this now : And whoever is capable of coming to Christ now, with a Design and Purpose to be *profelyted* to him, by Faith, Repentance, Love, &c. let them be young or old, we are so far from hindring them, that we had rather do all we can to help them forward. But, if this don't please you, good now do so much as tell us plainly, what you mean by *Profelytism*, when you say, *Children are capable of Profelytism* ; wherein lies their Capacity, or what is it they are capable of doing ? or whether there is any thing requir'd of them in order thereunto ? If any thing, what ? If nothing, why are not all *Profelytes* as well as any ? or how shall we do to know the Capacity of a *Believer's* Child, from an *Unbeliever's* ? If they are both *alike* in Capacity, then there is no *difference* : If there is a *difference* in the Capacity of the Children of *Believers* and *Unbelievers*, pray tell us where it lies ; especially, since the Children that came to Christ, were Children indefinitely : or whether it be any Child's *Vertue* to be a *Profelyte*, or *fault* that it is not ? or whether this young *Profelyte*, you talk of, understands any thing more of the Mind of God in *Baptism* with it, than it or another did, or may without it ? For if it be no fitter for *Baptism* with it, than it or another is without it, pray what is it you talk of ? For we say none are fit for *Baptism*, that know nothing of it, or care nothing for it. But if its Qualifications

for

for Baptism be increased by it, tell us by what means? Truly for ought I know, you may even intend as little by it when you say they are capable of *Profelytism*, than as if you had told us they are capable of *Sleeping*. But to enlarge no farther upon this, I shall only say that it's a very plain Case, that this Text will do no Service for *Infant-Baptism*.

First, Because there is not one Word of *Baptism* spoke of in the Text, tho recorded by three Evangelists; and it is not likely that a Text that makes nothing for *any Body's* Baptism, should make any thing for *Infant-Baptism*.

Secondly, Because our *Saviour* makes no improvement of such an Argument as this to your purpose; and yet doubtless he knew as much of their *Profelytism* as you can pretend to know: And if he did not, pray, why should you? He saw nothing in it for their *Baptism*, I marvel how you came to be so strong-sighted: Yet you are so far from being able to prove that Christ *baptized* these Children, that we are able to prove he baptized them not; as appears, Joh. 4. 2. *Jesus himself baptized none*. And if so, this Text rather affords an Argument against *Infant-Baptism* than for it. And if you will not believe me, I shall leave you to struggle with Dr. *Taylor* about it; who tells us, *The Conclusion would with more probability be derived thus; Christ blessed Children, and so dismissed them, but baptized them not: Therefore Infants are not to be baptized*. Let us see, Sirs, when you will be able to give us a better Argument for it, than this is against it.

You tell us you meet with Instances of Children that have been so young, some before they could either go or speak, that have had strange *Exits* into another World: Well, and what then? pray, what's all this to *Infant-Baptism*? Certainly, their going out of this World, let it be by what *Exit* it will, can be no Argument for their *Baptism*; unless you will suppose that they ought to be baptized after they are *dead*, or else in the *next World*, by virtue of their strange Departure out of *this*: For you cannot make use of this Argument till you have it, and you cannot have it till you see and know their *Exits* into another World; and then you have no sooner *got it*, but you have *lost it*. Besides, you cannot but know, that a thousand such Stories as these are not at all to the Question between us; for the Question in this Case between you and your *Antagonists*, is not concerning the *State of Infants*, but rather concerning their *Duty*, if there *is* any such thing in the World; and if there *be*, whether *Baptism* be any part of it: If there *be* not, then we think we may safely conclude *Infant-Baptism* to be no Duty. For we  
say,



say, all the true Subjects of Baptism are bound in *Duty* and *Conscience* to yield *Obedience* to God in that Ordinance, which *Infants* cannot do, neither is it required of them, neither do they lose any Priviledg, or one jot of God's Favour through the want of it. But if you say the Duty lies not upon the *Infants*, but upon the *Parents*; then if you would defend this Argument, you are bound to prove that God requires all such Parents, whose Children make such *Exits* at their Death, to baptize their dead *Children*; for they cannot come at this Argument sooner: But as for all other *Parents* and *Children*, this Argument concerns them not. And yet in the strength of this *miserable* Argument, you can *valiantly* trample upon your *Antagonists*, and boldly tell the World, that you may (by virtue of this rare Argument) *with all the Indignation imaginable, explode that uncharitable Position of the Anabaptists, that say, Children have no more Right to Baptism than unreasonable Creatures*: When, alas! this Position, let it be what it will, appears to be not one jot *better* or *worse*, either for your *Indignation*, or for the *Argument* from whence it flows. However, Sirs, we only say *Infants* have no Right to *Baptism* by God's Appointment, for God requires no such thing of them, nor from them: if you say they have, for my part I should be very well pleased to see you able to prove it: But if you cannot prove it, you ought to be as well pleased to let it be otherwise, without reflecting upon any Body. Now, indeed, there is a *Consequential Truth* in it, which I know you love dearly to aggravate, if by any means you may render us obnoxious to the Hatred and Displeasure of the Foolish. For I confess, it cannot properly be said that they that have no Right at all to a thing, can have *any more* Right to that thing, than any *other* thing that has likewise no Right to the same. And yet we have not the least uncharitableness in our Breasts or Thoughts against *Infants*; for we say they are not one tittle the worse for having no Right to Baptism, nor any thing the less in the *Love* and *Favour* of God *without it*: It only argues that *Baptism* is beyond their reach and capacity; and as it is so, God neither requires nor expects they should be concern'd about it. And pray, Sirs, what's that to *you*, or to *me* either, if it be so? If this be the Case, who is it you quarrel with? Now, Sirs, 'tis you *Pedo-Baptists* rather that are so uncharitable toward poor *Infants*, that unless you may have your own Wills, and have them baptiz'd (as you miscall it) not only whether they themselves will or no, but even whether God will or no, you presently grow so *Surly* and *Ill-condition'd* towards poor harmless *Babes*, that there's scarce one in forty of you can afford them a good

word ; and not only so, but condemn, censure and sentence them far beyond what they dare pretend to do by any *unreasonable Creature*. Besides all this, *Gentlemen*, you forget that you your selves are guilty of the self-same Crime, or at least a Crime of the same Nature, which you here pretend with so much *Indignation* to *explode* : And why may not we reflect upon you, as well as you upon us, by telling you, That we may with all the *Indignation* imaginable *explode* that *uncharitable Position* of *Pedo-Baptists*, that say *Infants* have no more Right to the Lord's Supper than *unreasonable Creatures* ? Is not this altogether as sayable from your practice, as the other is from *theirs* ? and is not this as *bad* and as *uncharitable* a Position as the other ? What's the Matter, *Sirs*, that you seem to be so *quick-sighted* abroad, and so *very blind* at home ?

But above all things, I perceive, I must not forget the Instance of the *Ruler's Daughter* ; for it seems there lies so much strength in that for *Infant-Baptism*, that it must be reckon'd a piece of *Cowardise* to evade it. You say, you would ask such Persons who deny *Infants* *uncapable* of *Baptism*, because they can shew no *actual Sign* of it. By the way, *Sirs*, I must demand of you who are the Persons you mean here, that deny *Infants* to be *uncapable* of *Baptism* ? Surely you cannot mean the People you call *Anabaptists* ; for they plainly say, that *Infants* are *uncapable* of *Baptism* : and if any will say that they can and do give *Actual Signs* and *Demonstrations* of their Incapacity in that Case, I shall not reckon it worth my while to contradict them. Here, *Sirs*, you seem to be so eager in the discharge of this *Mortar-piece*, that you have miserably *over-shot* your selves, which you it seems look'd upon to be so formidable, that because the *Gentleman* in his *Animadversions* thought it had been *empty*, and so passed it by as a *useless* thing ; you reckon it was because he was *afraid* to come near it. Well, however, some Body it is you have a mind to ask what they think of the *Ruler's Daughter* ? Our *Saviour*, say you, *bid him only believe, and it should be done*. Would not any now be ready to think, that surely this must be some plain Instance of *Infant-Baptism* ? when they that are suppos'd to deny it are so briskly and closely call'd upon to tell their *Thoughts* of such a *particular* Instance, that is in short, without any Paraphrase, brought to *confute* them. Certainly if it chance to prove a Story of *another* Nature, and relate to *another* thing, and not at all to *Infant-Baptism*, our *Gentlemen* then must needs be strangely *impertinent*, and deserve to be corrected in their Imperious Confidence. Now let any Body, for tryal-sake, but read the Story as it's recorded by three Evangelists, in *Mat. 9. Mark 5. and Luke 8.* and they will find it to be only a Story, wherein is compre-

hended



hended an excellent Relation of our *Saviour's* Power and Compassion towards poor Mortals, manifested in restoring a young *Damsel* to Life and Health, even when she was supposed to have been dead. And now, *Sirs*, my *Thoughts* of the *Ruler's Daughter*, is, that she was recover'd by our *Saviour* from a very dangerous Distemper, and given as it were again to her Father, as a fresh token of our *Saviour's* Kindness to him. And for you only to say (as you do in your Second Paper) *this shews that believing Parents Faith avail for their Children*. What is it you talk of? you must needs know 'tis nothing to your purpose: For, in the Sense of this Text, who ever deny'd it? We deny not, but the Father's Faith, Humility and Love to Christ might and did greatly avail herein, as to the Recovery and Restoration of his Daughter: but still we deny, that she immediately became a true and proper Subject of Baptism, by her Father's Faith; there is not the least Shadow of such an *availment* in the Text: Our *Saviour* doth not say, *believe*, and thy Daughter shall be baptized, nor any thing tending thereunto. And, *Sirs*, you ought to know, that if you plead for *Infant-Baptism* upon the *Parents Faith*, nothing short of such a-like Instance will, or can, do your Business: You know very well, that whether a good Man's Faith, and pious Endeavours, may or may not be *available*, in the behalf of a Child, a Wife, a Servant, a Neighbour, a Friend, yea or an Enemy either, in some respects, is no part of the Question in Debate. And if you should affirm that it may, and sometimes is available, who do you think will be your Enemy therein? Now for you to *clap your Wings*, as it were, and *crow* as if you had got some famous Victory, by discharging this Piece, when you know you have not so much as kill'd a Flea in your Enemies Quarters; What strange Men are you? Pray, *Sirs*, why were you not so publick-spirited as to bring in the Centurion's Servant to take his share of Right to Baptism, out of the common stock of *second-hand Faith*? Was not his Master's Faith as *available* to him, as the Ruler's was to his Daughter? Pray read the Story in *Mat. 8.* and *Luke 7.* and you may easily perceive it was so. Now what Rule is this for you to baptize any of your Servants, whether they *believe* or not *believe*, meerly because *you your selves* believe, and plead their Right to Baptism by virtue of *your Faith*? Besides, If this Argument were good for the purpose you bring it, I cannot imagine who must be excluded from Baptism: For it will not only take in any ungodly Person whatsoever, upon whose account a godly Man may, in some respects, prevail with God; but it will take in whole Cities of ungodly Men by the Lump, and make them all immediately true Subjects of Baptism,

without any Change or Alteration at all in themselves. For you know God, upon *Abraham's* Request, offer'd to spare the whole City of *Sodom*, if there could have been but *Ten* Righteous Persons found in it : And it had certainly been sav'd from that fearful and amazing Ruin and Destruction that besel it, if only *Ten* had been there found. Now the *Argument* is the same in its *Nature* and *Consequence*, tho they were not found as if they had been found ; and if they had been there found, pray tell us what you would have to be the Consequence of your Argument, concerning all the rest of the Inhabitants ? And if God should shew any Kindness to any City, Place or Kingdom *now a-days*, upon the account of the *Faith* and *Prayers* of some Righteous Persons, as there's no doubt but he doth, Would not this Argument turn all the Inhabitants immediately into Subjects of Baptism ? And who knows but in your next you may improve it to the utmost ; and why not ? For it is of the same Stamp with the *Ruler's Daughter* : And we know you are *Valiant*, and dare venture upon very great Undertakings.

You likewise tell us, That 'tis a great Weakness to believe Children not baptized from the example of the *Jaylor*. Indeed, Sirs, I rather think 'tis a greater Weakness for any to believe they were : If by that ambiguous Term, *Children*, you mean little *Infants*, such as you frequently baptize : And 'tis not your *Syriac Latiniz'd* that will help you at this turn. For pray, Sirs, what great Discovery have you made by going to *Syria*, and there hearing of the *Jaylor's Sons* ? You need not have taken that pains, (especially since 'tis to no purpose) for we can freely grant you, without putting you to struggle for it, that the *Jaylor* might have several *Sons*, yea and *Daughters* too : And if he had had ten *Sons*, and as many *Daughters*, I readily acknowledg that in all probability they were all baptiz'd. I will not so much as suppose that any of his *House*, let them be *Sons* or *Daughters*, or *Servants*, or what else you please, were here exempted from being baptized. But yet still, Sirs, you cannot chuse but know (or else you must be horribly ignorant) that all this does you no Service at all for *Infant-Baptism* ; you are still but where you were, you have gain'd nothing at all by this *Syriac* Bargain, tho you seem as great upon it, as if you had been at some profitable Market : For surely nothing can be more evident, than that all that were here baptized in, or of, the *Jaylor's House*, were grown Persons, and famous *Converts*, not only *Actual*, but *Active*, *Lively*, and *Spiritous Believers*. For how plainly does the Text tell us that they spake the Word of the Lord to the *Jaylor*, and to all that were in his House.

Here



Here it seems *teaching* went before *baptizing*, however it came about. But do we hear of any *Infants* yet? Altho we should suppose them all to be *Sons*, which is not probable, for there might be *Daughters* as well as *Sons*, and *Servants* as well as either: But not an *Infant* amongst them all. And when he and all his were baptized, he brings his welcome Prisoners into his House, and like a good Christian, set Meat before them, *and rejoyced, believing in God, with all his House*. Suppose it were *all the Sons* of his House still, it's the same thing, it's plain they were *All Believers*, let them be whose *Sons* they will. What a strange thing it is, that our *Gentlemen* cannot understand them to be *Believers*, meerly because it's thought they might be *Sons*: When alas! the *Faylor* himself, no doubt, had a *Father*, and was certainly Some-body's *Son*. Now it seems it lies within the reach of our *Gentlemens* Understanding, that the *Faylor* himself might be a *Believer*, but they cannot think that his *Sons* should be such: Pray, Sirs, why might not the *Faylor's Sons*, if he had any, be *Believers* as well as their *Grand-Father's Son*? 'Tis true any Body would be ready to think they might, and not only so, but that in reality they were so too. But then this quite spoils our *Gentlemens* Business, for they must have *Infants*, or they die. And therefore, rather than they will admit of this, they'll venture to tell you, 'tis *Nonsense to urge from the consequent Text, that those which were baptized, glorified and praised God, which Children could not do*: And that which proves it Nonsense, is, because it *only means such as were capable of doing it*. *Gentlemen*, 'tis very true; you are now in the Right, 'tis only meant of such as were *capable of doing it*: But then 'tis *as true*, that it means *all of the Faylor's House* that were *baptized*; for it's certain that *all* that were here baptized, were *capable of so doing*, and *did so do*. If I be so *honest* as to grant what you say in the former, I hope you will not be so *dishonest* as to deny what I and the Text both say in the latter: For it's a plain Case, that there were *no more* baptized of the *Faylor's House* than what were first *Converted* by the preaching of the *Word of the Lord*; and glorified God in the strength of their Faith: But *Infants* are not capable of this: *Ergo*, All your *Infants* are lost.

There's one *profound* Observation more which you make hereabouts, which I shall a little Remark, and so proceed to something else. *At their Rate*, say you, *we shall have all the Children of Anabaptists starved*: For 'tis said, *he that will not work, let him not eat*: But Children must eat, tho not capable of working, &c. But why I beseech you at *their Rate*, any more than at *your Rate*? What is it that makes them so guilty in this

this *sad* supposed *Murder* any more than *your selves*? You have not in any measure made it appear, how *they* stand chargeable with such a *Crime*, whilst *your selves* remain Innocent: I wish you had attempted it, for assuredly, Sirs, such a *Charge* requires a *Demonstration*. But inasmuch as many ignorant People will be apt to take it for granted, merely because you tell them so, tho they know no more why than a Post: I shall guess at your meaning as well as I can, and either *clear* the *Baptists* of this frightful Suggestion, or else bring *you* in *guilty* along with them. Now, I hope, we may take this Proposition for granted without any more a-do; Namely, that *you* are not at all guilty of this strange *Plot* against all the *Infants in the World*. Now if I can but make it appear, that if *you* be Innocent, *they* cannot be Guilty; or if *they* be Guilty, *you* cannot be Innocent: I hope you will be willing to dismiss them without Damage. Your meaning then certainly, I think, must be to this purpose; That forasmuch as the *Baptists* say that *Infants* are not to be *baptized*, because not capable of *believing*; They may as well, and do in effect say, that *Infants* must not *eat*, because not capable of *working*; for tho *Faith* is required of grown Persons in order to *Baptism*, so is *Working* required of *them* in order to *Eating*. But now *Infants* may either be *baptized* without *believing*, or else it will follow that they may not *eat* without *working*. Herein I reckon I have done you the utmost Justice imaginable, in stating your Proof to the full, which you ought to have done your selves; but perhaps you durst not, lest your Folly should have been the more easily discovered. Now, Gentlemen, I intend to join *Issue* with you, and see what Conclusion we can bring it to. Sirs, why may not I as well conclude, that because you say that *Infants* are not to be admitted to the *Lord's Supper*, because not capable of *Self-Examination*, or *discerning the Lord's Body*; you may as well say that *Infants* must not *eat*, because not capable of *working*: For tho *Self-Examination* &c. is required of grown Persons, as previous to the *Lord's Supper*, and *working* required of them in order to *eating*; But as for *Infants* they must either be admitted to the *Lord's Supper*, without *Self-Examination*, or else it will follow that they must not *eat* without *working*: And therefore at your Rate all your Children must be *starv'd*, and not only so, but the *Race of all Christians*, nay of the whole *World*, must soon be *extirpated*, as you very boldly tell us in your Paper. Now, Sirs, your *Charge* is very fairly return'd upon your selves; What say you, *Guilty* or *not Guilty*? To suppose you will plead *Guilty* here, would be little less than to commit *Sacrilege*; yet if you say *Not Guilty*, you do in so saying fully acquit your *Anta-*  
*gonists*:



*gonists*: For now it appears, that if you be *Innocent*, they cannot be *GUILTY*: And so I hope this dreadful *Tattle* of *starving Infants* is blown over, and come to nothing. Yet, Sirs, I think you ought to take some *blame* and *shame* too, to your selves, for being so mighty willing to expose and condemn your Neighbour for nothing. I shall only say thus much more for the present to this matter, and so leave it, *viz.* If you had but clearly prov'd that God has given you the like Command and Authority to baptize Children in their *Infancy*, as he hath doneto *Fathers* and *Mothers* to feed them in their *Infancy*, you had then said something to the purpose; otherwise you had far better have said nothing.

But the Text saith, *Act. 2. 39. The Promise is to you, and to your Children.* Well, Sirs, it doth so: But how comes this Text to be any thing to your purpose for *Infant-Baptism*? especially, unless you were able to prove, that by *Children* here is undoubtedly meant *Infants*, which I doubt you will find such a Task, as you will hardly ever live to finish: What, Sirs, do you take it for granted that *Infants* must here be understood, meerly because you find the Word *Children* in the Text? What strange Reasoning is this? Is this one of your necessary and unavoidable Consequences you talk of in your Paper? Why may you not as well conclude, that because the Text tells us, *Josh. 2. 2. That the Children of Reuben and the Children of Gad built them an Altar*: Ergo, The *Infants* of *Reuben* and *Gad* were *Masons* and *Stone-Cutters*. And because it's said concerning the Vertuous Woman, *Prov. 31. 28. Her Children rise up and call her Blessed*: Therefore her *Infants* of eight Days old did so. And our Saviour saith of *Jerusalem*, *How often would I have gather'd thy Children together, as a Hen gathereth her Chickens under her Wings, and ye would not?* Can it rationally be supposed that our Saviour here means *Infants* in the Cradle? And yet a little Consideration will make you capable of discerning that *Infants* are not more excluded by these Texts, than they are by this Text now in Hand. For if *Infants* are here intended, then the Promise here mention'd, let it be what Promise it will, is not *Conditional*, but must be *Absolute*: But the Promise here spoken of is not *absolute*, but *conditional*: Ergo, &c. Repentance and Baptism is here plainly requir'd, as the Means or Condition leading to the Promise, unto which the Promise is annexed; without which the Promise is not to be claim'd. And the Promise is here mention'd as a *Motive* or *Encouragement* to perform the Duties or Condition requir'd. And who is it, that in the reading the Text is not able to discern this? If you were not strangely biassed, or devo-

devoted to an Error, methinks you might easily perceive, that by *you and your Children* in this Text, is meant the *Jews and their Posterity* after them, as they should come to close with this Doctrine now taught them : Wherein they are all encourag'd to fall in with Christ upon the Terms of the Gospel, for Remission of Sins and Salvation, notwithstanding their great and unparallel'd Wickedness, in killing the *Lord of Life*, and imprecating that dreadful *Curse* upon themselves, and their *Children*, or *Posterity*, the cutting Sense whereof, now upon their Hearts, might have been apt to have driven them to Despair, had it not been for *Peter's* Cordial : Wherefore the *Apostle* gives them to understand that God would not be so severe as to take such Advantage thereby, but that upon their hearty Repentance, and Submission to the Terms of Salvation required in the Gospel, *they* and their *Children*, or *Posterity* after them, upon the *same Terms*, should certainly be received to Mercy. All that I shall say more to this at present, shall be only to recommend to you the Sayings of two eminent *Church of England* Doctors, in Reference to this Text and Matter, *Dr. Hammond*, and *Dr. Taylor*.

*If any, saith Dr. Hammond, have made use of that unconcludent Argument, I have nothing to say in defence of them : I think, saith he, the Practice is founded upon better Basis than so ; and the word Children there, is really the Posterity of the Jews, and not particularly their Infant Children.*

And *Dr. Taylor*, upon this Scripture, saith ; *That the words mention'd in St. Peter's Sermon, are interpreted upon a weak Mistake : The Promise is to you and your Children, therefore Infants are actually receptive of it, in that Capacity ; that's the Argument : but the Reason of it is not yet discover'd, nor ever will : for to you, and your Children, is to you and your Posterity : to you and your Children, when they are of the same Capacity, in which you are receptive of the Promise : But he that, whenever the word Children is used in Scripture, shall by Children understand Infants, must needs believe, that in all Israel there were no Men ; but all were Infants. And if that had been true, it had been the greater Wonder they should overcome the Anakims, and beat the King of Moab ; and march so far, and discourse so well, for they were all called the Children of Israel. Now, Gentlemen, I leave you to your liberty, whether you will, in this case, contend further, or submit.*

But you say, *Children are in the Covenant, and they are holy, and of such is the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.* I might here justly enquire, what you mean by *Infants* being in the Covenant ; and whether you mean



*all Infants* in the World, or but some; if all, I wish you would tell us so; if but some, then which are they? or whether any thing is requir'd of them, or is to be done by them, in order to their getting into the *Covenant*? if any thing, what? if nothing, how came they in more than others? or whether it is their *Vertue* to be *in*, and the *Sin* of others to be *out*? or whether there is any *difference* in the *Capacity* of those that are *in*, and those that are *out*? Is their *Wildom*, *Knowledg*, *Judgment* and *Understanding*, *Increas'd* by it, or not? if you say it is, you must make it manifest: but if not, then there is *no difference* betwixt them and *others*, in respect of their *Fitness* for *Baptism*, &c. I say, I might enlarge and insilt upon several things of this kind: Which I confess, I could be glad to be resolv'd in: But for the present I shall not here insilt, but shall rather take you at all *Adventures*; and mean what you please by all these *Allegations*, I shall endeavour to shew you, that there is *nothing at all* in them for *your purpose*. For what if I grant you all you say in these cases, that *Infants* are in the *Covenant*, and *Holy*, and *such as shall be saved*, &c. what then? if you infer, that *then*, or *therefore*, they ought to be *baptis'd*, I deny that *Consequence*: for by this *Rule*, *Moses* might have *baptis'd* *Infants* as well as you, if a *bare* being in the *Covenant*, &c. were sufficient to warrant the *Practice*: however, *Sirs*, he might have *circumcis'd* them, the *first*, *second*, or *third Day* after they were born, as well as to have *taid* till the *eighth Day*: for certainly, they were as *holy*, and as much *in the Covenant*, and as *fit for the Kingdom of Heaven* the *first* or *second Day*, as they were the *eighth*: and what's the reason think you that he did not? He might also have *circumcis'd* *Females*, if this had been good *Reasoning*, for there's no doubt to be made, but *they* were *holy*, and in the *Covenant*, and *such as should be saved*, as well as the *Males*. But if he had done so, would he not (think you) have been a *Transgressor* rather than a *faithful Servant*? Yet he might have taken up *your Plea*, and defended himself altogether as well as you do or can, in the business of *Infant-baptism*: but it's a plain case, he did not *like* this *Argument*. But, *Sirs*, you ought to remember that the *Will* and *Pleasure* of *God*, ought in a special manner to be heeded in all such Cases: for it is the *Command of God* that gives *Life* and *Being* to all *Duty*, *without which*, all your *Allegations* are in vain: *with which*, we should gladly cease to contend; and that's the reason why *Infants* were *circumcis'd* precisely upon the *eighth Day*, either before, or after, would certainly have incurr'd *Displeasure*. And this was

that which kept *Females* from *Circumcision*, tho *holy* and in *Covenant*, as well as *Males*. Nay, if *Christ* had not commanded *Believers* to be *baptis'd*, their being *Believers* would not have *justified* the *Practice*, neither will it now *justify* any other *Practice* that he never *commanded* or *appointed* to be done. Besides, *Sirs*, do you not herein *sin*, because *Grace* abounds? for is *God* so good and gracious, as to place our *Infants* in *Covenant* with himself, must we therefore take the *holy Name* of *God* in vain, and sprinkle *Water* upon their *Faces*, as if we suppos'd the *Covenant* worth nothing, unless we confirm it with our own *Inventions*, and clap a *Seal* to it of our own making, without any *order* from him so to do? *Sirs*, if *Infants* be in *Covenant*, be content there to let them rest, without disturbing or interrupting them in it: be content with that, till you are able to make them sensible of the *Obligations* that may lie upon them, by virtue thereof to discharge *Duty* towards *God*.

I have only two *Demands* to make, and then I shall leave this to *Consideration* :

*First*, Pray, *Sirs*, tell us, do you think *Christ* and his *Apostles* did not know as much of this *Nature*, concerning *Infants*, as you do? do you think they were not as well acquainted with their being *holy* and in the *Covenant*, and *such as should be sav'd*, as you are? I hope, as *Learned* as you are, you will hardly venture to say they did not: yet where did *Christ*, or any of his *Apostles*, give either *Command* or *Permission*, to any *Body*, to *baptise* their *Infants* upon any of *these* accounts? Where is there the least *Sign* or *Shadow* of such a thing, in all the *New-Testament*? If you know of any, pray produce it, and let us see it, that we may read and understand such a thing as well as your selves; and in so doing, the *Controversy* would soon be ended: but if there be no such thing to be found in *Scripture*, what does all your stir about these things signify? if you should argue and write for three seven *Years* together, what is it all worth, unless you bring *Scripture-warrant* for what you affirm and practise?

My second *Demand* upon this account, is as followeth: Supposing all these things to be unquestionably true that you talk of; that *Infants* are in the *Covenant*, *holy*, and *such as shall be saved*, and what you please of that kind: How comes this to intitle them any more to *Baptism* than it doth to the *Lord's-Supper*? What's the reason, (I beseech you) you do not receive them to the *Lord's Table* upon these *Accounts*, as well as admit them to *Baptism*? Are you able to give us an *Instance* in all the *New-Testament* of any that were accepted as fit  
Subjects



Subjects of *Baptism*, and at the same time, as such, reckon'd and known to be *unfit* for, and *uncapable* of the Communion of Saints in the *Supper of the Lord*? I marvel, Sirs, what you make of *Baptism*, that you should think *Infants* so fitly and fully qualify'd for that, and yet dare not venture to plead, either *Right*, or *Obligation* to any other Gospel-duty : Is not *Baptism* a *Gospel-requirement* as well as the *Lord's Supper*? a Command of Christ, an Ordinance of Heaven, and part of that Service and Obedience which Christians owe to God, in and under the Gospel? And do you think it ought not to be done with more Knowledge, Judgment and Reverence, than *Infants of seven Days old* are capable of? What *Subjection*, or *Obedience* to God, is there, or can there be, in a *little Infant* in the performance of that which you call its *Baptism*, when it knows nothing at all of the thing *commanded*, nor of the *Law-giver commanding*, nor any reason in the World why it should, or should not submit; neither is it capable of thinking either well, or ill, concerning any thing relating thereunto? How then can it be done as a *Duty*, in *Obedience* to Christ, as the answer of a *good Conscience* towards God, when the Subject knows nothing of these things, and is altogether *uncapable* of the least *motive* to *Subjection*? But if you say, *Infants* must notwithstanding all this, be admitted to *Baptism*, certainly you must needs wrong them greatly, in debarring them from the *Lord's Supper*. Gentlemen, these things deserves to be well consider'd; and then take *Advice*, and speak your Minds.

As to what you say about *universal consent of Churches*, and *Antiquity* for *Infant-Baptism*, I shall not so much as concern my self to enquire after the Truth or Falshood of the matter; because, let it be true or false, all the while it is *Scriptureless*, there is not the weight of a Feather in it: It neither *hurts us*, nor *helps you*, in this Case. For what does all the *Consent* you talk of signify, unless you can clearly prove the thing *consented* to, to be Truth without it? And if you can, then you have no need of its help; but if you cannot, it has no help for you; for it is not the greatest *Consent* imaginable that can make a *Falshood* Truth: It must either be *Truth* previous to that *Consent*, or else it remains a *Falshood* notwithstanding that *Consent*: The *Consent* it self can be no Argument to prove it *Truth*. So that all that appears from this Argument, if all that you say were suppos'd to be unquestionably true, is only this, That a *great many People* a *great while agoe* held *Infant-Baptism*; but whether they did well or ill, in so doing, still remains the Question, as much as ever: And if it want the true

*Primitive Mark of Antiquity*, let it be as *old* as it will, 'tis never the better for that, but indeed the worse; for that only serves to prove it an *old over-grown Error*. As *old* as it is, it is not *old* enough to be *Truth*, because *from the beginning it was not so*. 'Tis in vain to talk of *Antiquity*, all the while you want the true ground thereof; for if that be wanting, all your talk of *Antiquity* is so far from being an Argument for it, that it is clearly an Argument against it: For if it be *very old*, and of a *long standing*, and yet not *old* enough to be *Truth*, it's high time for us, even for that Reason, to reject and explode it with Indignation. As a Learned *Church of England Doctor* well observes and directs, speaking of *old Popish Pretensions*, *When they obtrude (saith he) their Revelations, or teach for Doctrines of God the Commandments of Men; we must ask them every one how they read in the Beginning: We may not draw out of their Ditches, be the Current never so long, whilst we have Waters of our own of a nobler taste, which we can easily trace back to the Chrystal Spring, &c.*

The next Question you undertake to Answer, is, *Whether Infant-Baptism is to be found in Scripture?* Your Answer is not expressly in the Letter, but from necessary and unavoidable Consequences, as, say you, we have already shewn, &c. Now, Gentlemen, if the latter part of your Answer here were but as true as the former is, I should very readily give you the Case, and Dispute no more; for I am clearly of the Opinion, that whatsoever is truly prov'd by necessary and unavoidable Consequences from Scripture, is sufficiently prov'd, as you say, to all disinterested Persons. But the misery of it is, we could never yet see these necessary and unavoidable Consequences; but your Consequences are all so grievous sick of one Distemper or another, that all the Doctors in Christendom will never be able to make them sound: And this we have pretty well found by your Consequences hitherto produc'd; unto which I refer, having not now time to repeat. Besides, Gentlemen, if it be true, that there is nothing of *Infant-Baptism* to be found expressly in the Letter of the Scripture, I cannot readily understand how you can come by those necessary and unavoidable Consequences you talk of: for tho it is true you may lay down a Proposition in such Terms as cannot be proved *verbatim* from Scripture, and yet I confess it may be well enough prov'd from very good Consequences. But if there is nothing at all expressly in Scripture about it, not one Word in the Letter concerning it, I'me afraid you must be content to go without those necessary and unavoidable Consequences. Sirs, will you say that there is nothing of the Doctrine of the Trinity, or three in one, to be found expressly



expressly in the Scripture? Is there nothing expressly of the God-head of Christ, or of his being born of the *Virgin Mary*, to be found in the Scripture? If there is not, for my part I know no Reason in the World they should be received for such Great and Orthodox Truths: But if there is, What strange Men are you to talk at this extravagant Rate, as if the Scripture spoke nothing expressly about these Matters? And how boldly do you insinuate and endeavour to make the World believe, that *Infant-Baptism* is at least altogether as plain in Scripture, as Christ's being born of the *Virgin Mary*; and ~~that~~ altogether as dark and as hard to be prov'd from Scripture as *Infant-Baptism*. Now, Sirs, this Insinuation is either true or false: If false, don't you deserve to be severely corrected for such Imperious Tricks? But if you stand by it, and say it is true, How do you think you would come off if we should join Issue with you about it, and bring the matter to a Tryal? But I confess I have been so large hitherto, beyond my first Thoughts or Intentions, that I shall say no more to this at present, and not much to what remains.

There is no less than three Questions following which you undertake to answer, which I reckon so inconsiderable and insignificant, both Questions and Answers, that I count it not worth my while to spend one Line about them. I therefore purposely omit them (time being precious with me) for the sake of something else which I judg more worthy to be noted; wherefore I wave the *Fourth*, *Sixth* and *Seventh* Questions, and pass on to the *Eighth*, and shall take some small notice of the *Fifth*, last of all, and so draw to a Conclusion.

The *Eighth* and Last Question you undertake to answer, runs thus: *Whether Children have Faith or no, since Faith and Repentance are pre-requisite to Baptism?* To which you answer and say, *That you have already shew'd that according to the Words of the Commission, Baptizing goes before Teaching: Therefore there is no such pre-requisiteness as some dream of, &c.* But, Sirs, I tell you plainly this is a meer idle swagger, for you have shewed no such matter, but the contrary does most evidently appear; therefore there is a greater pre-requisiteness of *Faith* and *Repentance* than you dream of. Why you refer us to *Acts. 9.* and tell us *our Saviour was born King of the Jews*, I cannot imagine: I wish I did but know your Inference. But you say further, *Admit Faith as pre-requisite to Baptism, you could answer that Children have Faith potentia, tho not in actu visibili; as an Artist, when he is indispos'd or asleep is potentially an Artist, tho not actually.* Sirs, it's a plain Case that you meerly speak what you list, not knowing what you say, nor whereof you:

*you affirm* : What is it that you may not say *Infants have, and are, if this kind of talk be allow'd you for good ?* Whatsoever you have a mind your *Infants* shall *have, or be,* put but *potentia* to it, and it's done. What if you had been in the Humour to have told us that *Infants* have the *Greek Tongue* and the rest of the *Oriental Languages,* and are as good *Preachers* as any in the World, *potentia,* tho not in *actu visibili* ; as an *Artist* when he is a-sleep, is *potentially* an *Artist* tho not *actually* ? Could you have expected that any Body in their Wits should have regarded you ? And why not in *this* I marvel, as well as in the *other* ? Besides, Sirs, what can you mean by Childrens having Faith *potentia* ? You do not mean that they do *actually* and *visibly* believe ; no by no means, that is not to be imagin'd. Well, but what then do you mean ? For my part I think it is partly the same thing, at if you had told us only that they have *Power, Might, Strength* and *Ability* to believe ; but yet, whatever the matter is, they *do not* believe : Notwithstanding this *potency* of believing, they neither do, nor can make any improvement of it so as to do the thing. And if this be true, good now what is it you talk of when you say *Infants* have Faith *potentia* ? And yet if they have *Power* and *Ability* to do it, it must needs be their *Sin* if they do it not. So that our *Gentlemen's* great Plea for *Infants* seems to prove a very *Fatal Charge* against them, for the damning *Sin* of willful Unbelief must needs lye upon them, if they have *Strength, Might* and *Ability* to believe, and make no use of it to act accordingly.

Moreover, What reason have you to conclude any Man to be an *Artist*, tho but *potentially* so, when you see him asleep, if you never saw, nor knew any thing at all of his being an *Artist* before ? if he had been asleep all the *Days* of his *Life,* you would have had small cause to have counted him an *Artist,* tho you had put the word *potentia* to it. But now *Infants* have (to follow your *Simile*) been asleep all their *Life-time,* in this case : You never, so much as saw, or knew of a time when they were so far awake, as to shew themselves *Believers,* as the *Artist* was to shew himself an *Artist* : So that as you have no reason to conclude any Man to be an *Artist* *potentially* when asleep, that you never knew to be any thing of an *Artist* *actually,* at one time or another before ; so you have no reason to conclude *Infants* *Believers* *potentially,* unless you had seen or known them at one time or another to have been *actually* such. So that I think you had as good blot out *potentia* (unless you will put it to their *Baptism* too) ; and let your Children rest without *Actual Baptism,* till you can write upon their Faith *Actu visibili.*



But you say, our Saviour is full to the purpose, who assures us, as you tell us in your Second, *that Children have Faith*, when he saith, *Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, &c.* Sirs, I do plainly confess that our Saviour is full to the purpose, but not to your purpose; for he does assure us, that the Persons here spoken of, were such as did really, properly, and *actually believe in him*: he does not so much as intimate any thing of their having Faith, *potentia*, but not in *actu visibili*; but in down-right terms tells us, they are such as *do believe in him*; which little *Infants*, I think, by your own Confession, cannot do: therefore, little *Infants* not here intended by our Saviour in this Passage; but only such as were *converted*, and *become as little Children*, in Plainness of Spirit, Humbleness, Innocency, and freedom from Malice. Our Saviour does not only assure us, that such shall be greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven; but also plainly tell us, that *whosoever shall offend, or scandalize, one of these*, thus converted, *little ones, which believe in him*, shall certainly incur great Displeasure from God. And this is easily discern'd, with a little Consideration, in reading the Text, and Coherence of the same: That after our Saviour had call'd a little Child, and taught his Disciples how they should be *converted*, and *become as little Children*, and *humble themselves as that little Child*; he under that Consideration, gives the Denomination of *little ones*, even to *such as should so learn and so do*, which did truly *believe in him*, from that *Analogy*, that was and ought to be, between *little Children* and *them*: therefore, whereas you argue thus, or to this purpose, [*These little ones which believe in me*;] *therefore Infants do believe*. I argue the direct contrary from the same Text, thus; *Those of whom Christ here speaks, did really believe in him: but little Infants neither do, nor can believe in Christ*: Ergo, *Christ speaks not here of little Infants*. To prove the Minor here, I thus reason; *Faith in Christ, comes by hearing the Word of God understandingly: but little Infants cannot hear the Word of God understandingly*: Ergo, *Little Infants cannot be Believers in Christ*. Again, if little Infants neither *do good or evil*, nor so much as *know good or evil*, then they can neither hear the Word of God understandingly, (for if they can, they must of necessity be capable of *knowing good*;) nor be *Believers in Christ*, for if they be, they must of necessity *do good*; for believing in *Christ* is one of the best things that can be *done* in the world. But the Scripture it self, besides Experience, plainly tells us concerning Infants, that they neither *do good*, or *evil*; nor *know good or evil*: Ergo, Rom. 9. 11. Dent. 1. 39. Isa. 7. 14, 15, 16. See the *Assembly Annotations* on this

Passage of our Saviour; and Reverend *Diodate* on the same: See also these Scriptures, where this Phrase, *little ones*, or *little Children*, is us'd to grown Believers, and Disciples of Christ; *Mat.* 10. 41, 42. *Joh.* 21. 5 *Gal.* 4. 19. 1 *Joh.* 2. 1, 12, 13, 18, 28. & 3. 7, 18. & 4. 4 & 5. 21.

Besides, *Gentlemen*, if you must and will have little *Infants* here intended, then it must and will, of necessity, be but a *Prosopopœia* however; and so do you no Service at all, tho we should out of Charity give you what you so earnestly beg for.

A few words to your Answer to the fifth Question, and so I draw to a Conclusion. The Question is only thus; *Why Sprinkling, and not Dipping?* To which you answer and say, *Our Church denies not the latter to any one that desires it; but looks upon it as a clear Representation of our Saviour's descending into the Grave, abiding there, and rising up again; according as the Apostle makes use of it, when he says, we are buried with him in Baptism.* Sirs, it's a clear case, that *Dipping* or *Covering* the Body under Water, was the true *Primitive, Apostolical* and *Scriptural* way of *Baptizing*: and you and your Church both, seems plainly to be convinc'd of the Truth hereof; by this free and full Confession and Acknowledgment which here you make; that it is a *clear Representation of our Saviour's descending into the Grave, abiding there, and rising up again*: and this you deliver, not as a Conceit that may come into a Man's Brains by chance; no, but 'tis very seriously given us, as a thing by your own Acknowledgment, which is according to Scripture, as the *Apostle himself makes use of it*, when he tells us, *we are buried with him in Baptism.* Now, Sirs, stand by this, and all's well; but if you will be so unfaithful, as to dissent these true primitive Colours, you certainly run away from *Truth* and *Substance*, to close with *Falshood* and *Vanity*: for either this is the mind of God, which you have here ventur'd to give us, or it is not: If it be not, wherefore did you urge it as a thing, not only *acceptable* to you and your Church, but even *acceptable* to God himself, as being *according to Scripture*? If it is the mind of God, what's the reason that you tattle of a *dispensing Power* in your Church with respect to this matter? As if the Mind of God, were altogether insignificant with you; that let God command what he please, you will be so stately as to conceit, that you may by virtue of your *dispensing Power*, do just what you list. And if he don't think good to accept of what you please to give him, as the result of your *Power*, tho 'tis but *Sprinkling*, for *Baptizing* or *Dipping*, he's like to get nothing else from you. Yet in your Plea for this *Power*, you do as good as dwindle it into nothing too: for you endeavour



deavour to make us believe that it only relates to *Circumstantial*s, and the *manner* of Acting, but not to the *Act* it self. Really, Sirs, if this be true, you had better have kept where you were, without the least pretence to this *dispensing Power*, for it can do you no Kindness at all : For if *Dipping* or *Burying* in Water, be the thing that God requires, then according to your own grant, your *Church* has not *Power* to dispense with this *Act*, and turn it into *another*, which cannot by any means be the *same Act* ; which is certainly the Case of *Dipping* and *Sprinkling* : For *Sprinkling* and *Baptizing* are certainly two different Things, two different Actions, having two different Forms, and cannot by any means properly be called the same. All that you can fairly pretend to, if you be true to your Plea, is, That the Administrator is at liberty to *dip*, or put the Person *under Water*, divers manner of Ways, as forward, backward, sideway, toward the Right-Hand, or toward the Left, quickly, or slowly ; all these Things being meerly *Circumstantial* ; yet all this while *Dipping*, or putting *under Water*, is the *Act* or *Thing* to be done : Which if it be done, the Person may truly be said to be *baptized*, notwithstanding these different *Circumstances* ; because the Essential Form of *Baptism*, viz. *Dipping in Water*, is to be found in all these ways. But if you only *sprinkle* a little Water on his Face, that is quite *another Thing* ; not *another Circumstance* in which the same Thing is yet done, but clearly *another Act*, in which not the *same* but *another Thing* is done ; and the Person thereby is no more truly baptized, than as if you had given him a Flip or two with a wet Finger : For here is *differentia essentialis*, the very Formality of Baptism is absent. So that you had better continue your first Compliance with us, than strive as you do in your Second, to run away from us ; for 'tis certainly true, that if our Practice be *Right*, (as you know it is) yours must of necessity be *Wrong* : And all your idle *Greek Struggles* will never be able to make it otherwise.

I must, before I conclude, take a little notice of your great Argument so formally laid down in your Second Paper ; which I had like to have over-look'd and forgot : I confess it is here a little out of due place, but it's no great matter, better here than no where, lest you should think a meer *Sense* of its *Strength* frighted me from it. The Argument in form appears thus, *An Ordinance once enjoyn'd, and never repeal'd, is always in force : But the Ordinance of Childrens incovenanting was once in the Old Testament enjoyn'd, and was never repeal'd. Ergo, 'Tis yet in Force.* Good now, Sirs, do so much as tell us, what is the *Questi-*

in this Argument relates to? or what is it brought to prove? Sirs,  
 Do you urge this *Argument* to prove *Infant-Baptism*, or do you not?  
 If not, what Business has it here? If you do, certainly such an Argu-  
 ment was hardly ever laid down for such a purpose, by any that pre-  
 tended the least Skill in Logick: For there is not the least mention of  
*Infant-Baptism* in any part of the Argument. If you had intended the  
 Proof of *Infant-Baptism* by it, it ought to have run thus, *An Ordi-*  
*nance once enjoyn'd, and never repeal'd, is still in force: But the Ordinance of*  
*Infant-Baptism was once enjoyn'd, and was never repeal'd: Ergo, Infant-*  
*Baptism is still in force.* Now if you had argued thus, and prov'd  
 your *Minor*, you had then done your Business. But now, Sirs, what  
 is it you have done by this Argument? What *Ordinance* is this that  
 was once enjoyn'd and never repeal'd? One would think you must of  
 necessity mean either *Circumcision* or *Baptism*: If *Circumcision*, then  
 that's in force still, and 'tis *Circumcision* you plead for: If you mean  
*Baptism*, then I deny your *Minor*, and put you to prove that *Baptism*  
 was ever enjoyn'd as an *Ordinance* upon *Infants*. But if you mean  
 neither, but only a meer *Inconvenanting*, as you call it, altho I do not  
 well know what you mean by it, neither do I understand any thing  
 of such an Injunction separate from *Circumcision*; yet, for Discourse-  
 sake, I give it you, pray take it and make your best of it: *Inconvenant*  
 your Children as much as you will, or can, who shall hinder you?  
 But then you must not speak a Word of their *Baptism*, by virtue of  
 this Argument, for it's now suppos'd that this Argument neither *men-*  
*tions* or *means* *Baptism*, much less does it prove their *Baptism*: So that  
 you are as far to seek for *Infant-Baptism* as ever you were, unless you  
 had produc'd a *Precept*, or an *Appointment* of God for that purpose;  
 otherwise all the *Inconvenanting* you talk of will do you no good: For  
 if God had never commanded *Infants* to have been *Circumcised*, who  
 durst have done it, notwithstanding this Plea? So if he has no  
 where commanded *Infants* to be *baptized*, who shall dare to do it, not-  
 withstanding the same Plea? Altho you were sure you had it, which  
 I do not in the least believe, tho I will not at this time dispute it: Be-  
 sides, what need you care whether you have it or no? for you that  
 dare *baptize* your *Infants* without being enjoyn'd, what need you care  
 whether the other be enjoyn'd or no? what need you trouble your  
 selves, whether Childrens *inconvenanting* were once enjoyn'd or no?  
 or if it was, what matter is it if it should be *repeal'd*? You may as  
 well *baptize* them of your own pleasure, without this Plea, as with it.  
 For if God never appointed it, there's no Plea for it; but if he has  
 appointed



appointed it, there's none against it: So that if it be your pleasure, that *Infants* shall be *baptized*, you had as good insist upon your *Cherub's Power*, and never trouble the World with an Argument about it. And that will be the easiest way for you to answer the *three Sheets and a half* already publish'd (as you it seems are inform'd) by the joint Consent of the *principal Anabaptist Preachers in London*, or any other of their Papers: Because you know you have publickly oblig'd your selves to give a full answer to all the Questions in them, or to any other Questions or Objections that can be sent to you in the meantime. And the Remark that you make at the same time, is so Remarkable, that I shall make a Remark upon it. Your Remark is this, That surely had not the *Anabaptists* thought you had advanc'd something of moment, in your two *Mercuries* about *Infant-Baptism*, they would never have call'd in such assistance for the answering of them, or made such a stir about them.

Really, Sirs, I plainly perceive, that you are fully resolv'd, that every thing shall make for your Credit, let it be what it will: For here, because some few of them consented and thought good, your two *Mercuries* should be answer'd, and accordingly were so; you meerly make that an Argument of the Strength and Moment of your Matter contain'd therein: And yet, because the Gentleman in his *animadversions*, did but omit that impertinent Passage of the *Ruler's Daughter*, tho we may reasonably suppose it was, because he almost thought it below a Man to take notice of it; how bravely could you improve that poor Omission against him, and make that too an Argument of the great Strength and Moment of that Passage? So that you are the most fortunate Men alive. Your being answer'd signifies Greatness in you; not answering you, signifies the same? Every thing, it seems, works for the Reputation of the *Adventist Society*: What is it that Men so priviledg'd may not venture upon? You say likewise, If any *Anabaptists* are disoblig'd by your Reflections upon those call'd *Anabaptists in Germany*; you promise, or threaten, (for my part I know not which) to put the Matter in its true Light, which has never been done yet. Sirs, the main thing, I think, that they commonly mind in that case, is to observe the very great Folly and Weakness of you *Pedo-baptists*, who generally are mighty apt and forward to make a clutter about the *Anabaptists in Germany*, when you ought, instead thereof, to give us a good sound Argument for *Infant-Baptism*. We cannot imagine what you mean in so doing, or what should make you so silly, from time to time, without the least Occasion, Provocation or Reason, to be so miserably impertinent. Good now, Sirs, do

so much as tell us seriously, what it is you propound to your selves in your so doing: Do you give it us as an Argument for *Infant-Baptism*, or do you not; if not, then you your selves don't look upon it as any thing to your purpose, with respect to that Controversy; if you do, you are as much out in your *Methods*, as the Man was in his *Tools*, that bought a *Hammer* and a *Chizzel* to make his Neighbour a *Dubler*. But I'm afraid there is something worse in it yet than all this; and that is, you urge these things commonly, for no other reason, than thereby to expose the *Baptists* to the *Contempt* and *Hatred* of ignorant and undiscerning People; whom you are willing to hope, will believe you in all you say, without examining any thing: And from their great skill in *Logick*, will conclude, that all *Anabaptists* must be such, or one way or another as bad. If this be your design, Sirs, 'tis very bad; and 'tis no marvel, if those you call *Anabaptists* should be *disoblig'd* at it: but if you can clear your selves, pray do; for my part, I should be very glad herein to be mistaken. And that which aggravates your Folly herein, (to say no worse) is, that you cannot but know, that if your *Antagonists* were in the humour to recriminate, what an *Angean-Stable* might soon be made of your *unclean Oxen*: such a one as all the River *Alphans* would never be able to cleanse.

Moreover, if this *true Light* you talk of, be a *new Light*, as your words seem to imply, it may then justly be suspected to be your *own Invention*, and so nothing but *meer Darknes*; but if it be an *old Light*, then it will be the *same* as it was before, and I'm afraid too near a kin to *Guy Faux's* Dark-Lantern, to be good for any thing. However, Gentlemen, use your Pleasure, do what seemeth good in your own Eyes; only remember, *that for all these things God will bring you to Judgment*.



## Postscript.

**H**AVING a little Paper-room left, which I was not aware of till the *Press* convinc'd me of it, I shall a little reflect upon two or three things, which hitherto I have wholly omitted.

The First is, that *strange* and *prodigious* Ignorance, you seem to be guilty of, when you insinuate to the World, that there is not one Instance of *Female-Baptism* in all the Scripture. Sirs, Is it likely that you should be fit Persons to manage such a Controversy, *satisfactorily* and *convincingly*, wherein, and concerning which, you appear to be so *astonishingly* ignorant? yet this strange *Ignorance* of yours, is attended with as strange a *Confidence*, with which you boldly, and in the face of the Sun, challenge your *Antagonists* to shew where they have one Instance of *Female-Baptism*. Really, Sirs, in my opinion, it is (at least) a very great shame for any Man, or *Woman* either, (pretending to Christianity) of the meanest parts imaginable, to be so *horridly ignorant*, as here you appear to be: How much more then is your *Shame* and *Blame* increas'd and aggravated, when we consider with what *Magnifying Glasses* you look upon your selves, and what *publick* Pretences you make to Parts, Learning, Wit, and almost, if not altogether, *universal* Understanding? You confidently insinuate, that *Infant-Baptism* is as plainly to be found in Scripture as that of *Adult Females*. Now, Sirs, if this did but appear to be *truth*, we should then immediately have done disputing; but it is so far from appearing to be *truth*, that the contrary is not only easily demonstrated, but you *your selves* shall be my *Witness*, that it is directly *false*: for you plainly confess, in words at length, that *Infant-Baptism* is not *expressly* to be found in Scripture. Now then, if *Womens* being *baptiz'd*, is *expressly* to be found in Scripture, then you are *Witnesses* against *your selves* of the *Falseness* of that Suggestion: But the *Baptism* of *Women* is *expressly* to be found in Scripture; *Ergo*. See *Act*. 8. 12. & 16. 14, 15. All that I shall say more to this particular, is only this; that as you have publickly *abus'd*, and endeavour'd to *deceive* the World, by your ignorant, rash, and false Insinuations, especially in this matter, wherein you are so easily *detected* and *convicted*;

visited; so you ought at least to make as *publick* an *Acknowledgment* and *Recantation*, of this *Injury* done to the World by this *blind*, yet *bold* Attempt of yours: for it's no small matter thus to abuse the World, and make no conscience of making Compensation.

The second thing I would a little note, is a piece of *Divinity* and *Logick*, somewhat agreeable to the Ignorance just now complain'd of. When you tell us, that if Children *do behold the Face of God* in Heaven, *as* (say you) *our Saviour says*; then it follows, that they have *Faith in Heaven*; and (consequently) *why not on Earth*? To which I answer, That Children *do*, or may *behold* the Face of God in Heaven, I will not deny; yet I profess, I do not remember where our Saviour tells us so: however, it does not in the least follow, that *therefore* they have *Faith* in Heaven; but it rather strongly implies the contrary; because *Faith* and *Sight*, are plainly oppos'd to each other, 2 Cor. 5. 7. where the Apostle plainly tells us, that *here*, while we walk by *Faith*, we walk not by *Sight*: Implying, that while *Faith* continues, *Sight* is absent; consequently, when *Sight* comes, *Faith* disappears. Tho'tis true, *here*, whilst we are *in the Body*, we are absent from the Lord; and to see him that is *invisible*, must needs now be an Act of *Faith*, according to the Text you quote, Heb. 11. 27. But the time will come, when *Faith* will be turn'd into *Vision*, and *Promise*, which is the ground of Faith, into *Fruition*, which is the end of Faith. When we shall see *Face to Face*, see him as he is, and know as we are known, 1 Cor. 13. 12. 1 Joh. 3. 2. So that it's so far from being evident, that *Infants* have, or shall have *Faith* in Heaven, that it is, at least, a very great Question, whether such a thing can fairly be said of the greatest *actual Believer* in the World. But further, suppose we should give you the *Premises*, and grant you that *Infants* may have *Faith* in Heaven; your Conclusion is not a little to be admir'd, or rather your selves, for your strange skill in *Theological Logick*. Sirs, do you indeed look upon this to be good Reasoning, that because a thing is, or may be, thus or so, in Heaven, therefore it is, and must be so here on Earth? If you do not, why do you talk at this *extravagant* rate; and endeavour to impose that upon others, which you do not *believe* your selves? If you do, I must acknowledg, that all the *Wit* I have is not sufficient to discover the Greatness of your *Folly*; yet take a taste however: In Heaven, the Saints shall be wholly freed from all Sin, Sorrow and Trouble, of what nature soever: Ergo, Why not so here on Earth? In Heaven Saints shall be *immortal*: Ergo, Why not so here on Earth?



In *Heaven*, the now *vile Bodies* of Saints shall be *changed*, and be made like unto the *glorious Body* of Christ: Ergo, *Why not so here on Earth?* with much more of this nature. Certainly, Sirs, there's none could ever have thought you so preposterously ridiculous, if you had not your selves *proclaim'd* it upon the *House-top*. What a strange thing it is, that Men so *manifestly weak*, should yet be so *conceitedly strong*, as to suppose themselves able to answer all the *Questions, Arguments and Objections*, that can be sent them from the People call'd *Anabaptists*? But I hope you may yet live to see your *Vanity*, and so get into the Road of learning more *Wisdom*.

Thirdly; I cannot but note, how strangely sometimes you abuse your Antagonists, in asking them such kind of *Questions*, as imply an *Absurdity* in them, when they are no more concern'd in the *Questions* than *your selves*. As for instance, you very reprehensively ask them, *How the Faith of the Parent can put the Child further off from God*: and *how Children can lose by Christ's Coming, who came to take away the Sin of the World, &c.* Now, would not any Body be apt to think, that the *Baptists* must needs hold the *Affirmative* here, in both these *Questions*; or else you must needs be very *impertinent* and *injurious* to them, thus *unworthily* to *insinuate*? Now, Sirs, I challenge you, to give an Instance if you can, of any amongst the *Baptists*, that ever told you, either in *Word* or *Writing*, that the *Faith* of the *Parent* put the *Child* further off from God; or that *Children* lost any thing by the *Coming of Christ*: for certainly, either you do know of some such, or you do not: if you do, you ought to put it out of *question*, for your own *Vindication*; and then I shall reckon them as *weak* in that, as you are in some other things: But if you know of none such, what *Shame* ought you to take to your selves, for thus *disingenuously misrepresenting* your *Antagonists* to the World, as if *those* very things were the *Questions* in debate betwixt you?

In the last place, I shall take a little notice what a strange Faculty there is generally in you *Pedo-baptists*, of *fawning* one upon another; how apt you are to *magnify* and *extol* one another, for every little *nothing* you do upon a Publick-Stage. This has been a *Fashion* of a long standing amongst you; that whoever carries the *Thing*, you still resolve to carry the *Thank*: and whoever *loses*, you must still ride *Triumphant*. And this is the Case of your *Postscript-Gentleman*, towards Mr. *Elliot* of *New-England*: Not that he so much as attempts to prove, that Mr. *Elliot* did *merit* or *deserve* any *Honour* for what (he there says) he did; but meerly, because Mr. *Elliot* did *something*,  
with

with which that *Gentleman* was pleas'd, therefore *Honour* will for ever redound to Mr. *Elliot* of *New-England*: Whereas, 'tis ten to one if the merit of the Cause were but thoroughly examin'd, and impartially consider'd, the *Honour* might rebound from Mr. *Elliot*, and redound to them which oppos'd him: and why not? for he only tells us, that he openly and earnestly maintain'd the Cause of *Infant-Baptism* against a sort of Persons, who forget that in the Gospel-Church, the *Promise* is to *Believers* and their *Children*; and are unwilling to reckon *Children* among the *Disciples* of *Christ*, &c. He scarcely so much as tells us, much less does he prove, that Mr. *Elliot* was in the *Truth*, and his *Antagonists* in an *Error*: so that still for ought we know, the *Honour* might belong to the other side, to them who openly and earnestly opposed the Cause of *Infant-Baptism*, against a sort of Persons, who forget that in the Gospel-Church, the *Promise*, he alludes to, is any otherwise, to any *Body*, than it is to every *Body*; or to *Believers Children*, any otherwise than it was to *Believers themselves*: namely, upon *Condition* of their believing, and performing the *Conditions* required in order thereunto; as their *Parents* before them were fain to do, before they had any *Interest* therein; for the *Promise* belongs to all the *World*, upon those *Conditions*, and to none in the *World* without them. For if it belong to any without *Condition*, then the *Promise* is absolute, and belongs as much to *Unbelievers* and their *Children*, as it can do to any *Body* else. And it's worth observing that these very Persons, unto whom *Peter* speaks these Words, were not themselves *Believers* as yet, but *Unbelievers*, when *Peter* spake these Words unto them, &c. Neither has this *Gentleman* told us at all, what *Infants* are the better for Mr. *Elliot*'s reckoning them *Disciples* of *Christ*: he has not so much as told us, that Mr. *Elliot* proved them so to be: And pray what *Advantage* can it be to poor *Infants* to be miscalled, and reckoned what they are not? What if Mr. *Elliot* of *New-England* had reckoned *Children* of *Believers* to be *Lawyers*, *Counsellors*, and *Judges*, would this have done the poor *Children* any Good, or have provoked any wise *Man* to have carried any of them a *Fee* to plead his Cause? Or, what *Honour* would have been due to Mr. *Elliot* for such an idle *Encomium*, any more than to those that should oppose him therein? But what kind of Folks those are that are unwilling to grant that of such is the *Kingdom of Heaven*, for my part I know not: Certainly there's no People in the *World* more guilty of such a thing than *Pedo-Baptists*. I am very much of the Mind that the *Gentleman* that talks of it, never met with a *Baptist*



in his Life, that could justly be charg'd with such a thing : But you *Pedo-baptists* generally say what you list, (especially in this Controversy) and matter not what you charge your *Antagonists* with ; for if you did, you would either not do as you do, or else often be *asham'd* where you are not : For it's well known, that there are a great many of the *Baptists* so far from what's here *insinuated*, that they do stedfastly believe that *all Infants in the World*, dying in Infancy, shall certainly be saved ; and some of them have writ Books to the same purpose, against the *Cruelty* of some *Pedo-baptists* that damn them by *Millions* : And tho there may possibly be some of the *Baptists*, that may not be of that Perswasion, yet the *worst* of them believe as well as the *most* of you, concerning them.

It may also be worth while to enquire wherein lay the *Greatness* and *Worth* of that thing in Mr. *Elliot*, to be so *earnest* to bring *Infants* under the *Bond* of the *Covenant*? May we suppose, that *Infants* being brought under this *Bond*, was really the *Act* and *Deed* of Mr. *Elliot* ? for so indeed the Words plainly seem to imply ; and if so, then it seems they never were under this *Bond* before, neither would it have been so *now*, if it had not been for *earnest* Mr. *Elliot* : Let any one judg then of the *Excellency* of this *Act*. Besides, what the *Gentleman* means by the *Bond* of the *Covenant*, who can imagin ? unless by *Bond* of the *Covenant*, he means the *Duties* which the *Covenant* binds and obliges People to perform towards God, I cannot guess at his Meaning : and if so, then what *Honour* is due to Mr. *Elliot*, may soon be discern'd, for bringing poor *uncapable* *Infants* under an *Obligation* to perform the *Duties* of the *Covenant*, and affording them no more *Strength* to perform them, than they had before they were brought under this *Obligation* ; and so through Mr. *Elliot's* *Earnestness*, poor *Infants* are undone for ever. But the best of it is, this is all *false*, a meer *idle Conceit* that has nothing in it ; or else Mr. *Elliot's* *Honour* had been rais'd upon the *Ruin* of *Infants*.

I have now done, when I have only told you, that the *principal Anabaptist Preachers* in London, (as you call them) were not at all concern'd in the *drawing up* of these few Sheets : for I can assure you it was done by a very *mean* and *private* Hand, by one, and one only, that is so far too from being a *principal Preacher*, or any *Preacher* at all, as that he is not accounted worthy to be a *Member* amongst them : neither had they, whom you call *principal Preachers*, nor any in a *publick Capacity*, any hand either in the *Composing* or *Publishing* of these Lines : But the *Author* was so *hardy*, as to get it printed of his own accord, and upon his

His own account, without being concern'd who were pleas'd or displeas'd at his so doing. Wherefore, whatsoever *Defects* appear to be in them, they are all *his own*; it is not fit, that any *Body* should so much as *share* with him in any thing that may be *justly due* upon that account; and whatsoever *mean* or *unworthy* Apprehensions you may have either of the *Author* or his *Work*, if you think it worth your while to take any publick Notice of it, pray speak *directly* to him, and to the *Matter in hand*, without *disingenuous* and *impertinent* Reflections: for I must signify to you, that as *mean* as the *Author* is, he is not altogether so *silly*, as to take *idle* and *impertinent* Reflections for *solid* and *satisfactory* Answers; but looks upon all *such Persons*, as the *greatest* and *worst* Sort of *Fools* in the World, that take *Sanctuary* in *such rotten* and *desolate* Buildings. Gentlemen, I do not *charge* you with any such thing *aforehand*, but only give you this *timely Admonition*, that if you should happen to *act* at that *rate* in your *Answers* to me, or any *Body else*, you might appear to be the more *inexcusable*: But if there should appear to be any *little Strength* in these *Lines*, pray do not think that you have yet got, either *all*, or the *principal Strength* that you may expect from the People you call *Anabaptists*, if further occasion require: For so long as the *Way of the Lord* continues *Strength to the Upright*, you may not expect to see an *end* of their *Strength*.

Here I fully design'd to have *ended*, but unless I had written somewhat *less* in my *Postscript*, I plainly perceive I must be *oblig'd* to write a *little more*, because my *Postscript* has *bespoke* a *little more Paper* than I first intended. I shall therefore *briefly* offer two or three *Arguments* to Consideration, against *Infant-Baptism*, without any *enlargement* at all, to *defend* or *secure* any part thereof, till I plainly *see* or *know* what *Objections* or *Exceptions* our *Antagonists* shall please to make against them.

*Arg. 1.* The *New Testament* doth *plainly*, *fully* and *sufficiently* declare to us who are the *true Subjects* of *Baptism*: But the *New Testament* doth neither *plainly*, *fully* nor *sufficiently* declare to us that *Infants* are the *true Subjects* of *Baptism*. Ergo, *Infants* are not the *true Subjects* of *Baptism*.

*Arg. 2.* None ought to be *Baptized* without *knowing* what they do, and *consenting* thereunto: But *Little Infants* are not capable either of *Knowledge* or *Consent* in that matter. Ergo, *Little Infants* ought not to be *Baptized*.

*Arg. 3.* That which there is no *Precept* for, nor *Precedent* of, nor *Promise* unto in all the *Word of God*, is not of *Divine Authority*: But there



there is no *Precept* for, *Precedent* of, nor *Promise* unto the *Baptizing* of *Infants* in all the *Word* of *God*. Ergo, *Baptizing* of *Infants* is not of *Divine Authority*.

*Arg. 4.* If *Infant-Baptism* be of *Divine Authority*, then it is (by the appointment of *God*) for some good *Ends* and *Purposes*: But *Infant-Baptism* is not (by the appointment of *God*) for any good *Ends* and *Purposes*. Ergo, It is not of *Divine Authority*.

*Arg. 5.* That *Doctrine* and *Practice*, that is not agreeable to the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of *John the Baptist*, *Christ* and his *Apostles*, is not of *Divine Authority*: But the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of *Infant-Baptism*, is not agreeable to the *Doctrine* and *Practice* of *John the Baptist*, *Christ* and his *Apostles*. Ergo, The *Doctrine* and *Practice* of *Infant-Baptism*, is not of *Divine Authority*.

*Arg. 6.* If *Infant-Baptism* be of *Divine Authority*, then it is a *Sin* in *Parents* to omit baptizing their *Infants*: But it is not a *Sin* in *Parents*, to omit baptizing their *Infants*. Ergo, *Infant-Baptism* is not of *Divine Authority*.

*Arg. 7.* That which is *substantially* and *severely* forbidden by the *Word* of *God*, is not of *Divine Authority*: But baptizing *Infants* in the *Name* of the *Lord*, is *substantially* and *severely* forbidden by the *Word* of *God*. Ergo, *Infant-Baptism* is not of *Divine Authority*.

I shall say nothing at present in the *Defence* of these *Arguments*, only leave them (thus *briefly* and *nakedly* laid down) to the *Consideration* of any that shall please to *peruse* them: But when I *perceive* what it is that my *Antagonists* have to say against them, or where their *Answers* or *Exceptions* will be chiefly concern'd, I shall then reckon my self oblig'd to prove whatsoever is deny'd, or else submit to the *Strength* and *Authority* of the *Answers* given.

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

Pag. 23. l. 6. r. came. P. 24. l. 5. r. will do you no service.





